

THE SOCIALIST REVIEW

AMERICAN RADICALISM

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

THE AMALGAMATED BEARS THE BRUNT

AN ANSWER TO THE OPEN SHOP

THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL A DEBATE

IS NORTH DAKOTA BANKRUPT?
WHAT KIND OF WORKERS' EDUCATION?
ARE THE WORKERS A MAJORITY?
IS THERE A NEW I. W. W.?

Contents

<p>THE FUTURE OF THE REVIEW Page 33</p> <p>WHAT AILS AMERICAN RADICALISM? William Z. Foster.....Page 36</p> <p>DEBS. A POEM Viola C. White.....Page 40</p> <p>LABOR'S ANSWER TO THE OPEN SHOP DRIVE William E. Bohn.....Page 41</p> <p>THE AMALGAMATED BEARS THE BRUNT Solon De Leon.....Page 45</p> <p>LAUNDRY. A POEM Babette DeutschPage 48</p> <p>WORKERS' EDUCATION: WHY AND WHAT? Alexander Fichandler.....Page 49</p> <p>IS THE PROLETARIAT A MAJORITY? Isaac A. Hourwich.....Page 51</p> <p>THE FIGHT IN NORTH DAKOTA H. G. Teigan.....Page 55</p>	<p>LABOR AND THE NORTH DAKOTA DRIVE Nonpartisan LeaguerPage 58</p> <p>AGAINST THE THIRD INTERNA- TIONAL B. C. Vladeck.....Page 59</p> <p>FOR THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL J. B. Salutsky.....Page 64</p> <p>THE NEW TURN OF THE I. W. W. Art Shields.....Page 69</p> <p>WHAT HAPPENED AT TOURS Francis Treat.....Page 72</p> <p>THE NOVEMBER ELECTIONS Isaac A. Hourwich.....Page 76</p> <p>BOOK REVIEWS: <i>Nationalism</i> G. P. Gooch.....Page 78 <i>Patriotism and the Superstate</i> J. L. Stocks.....Page 78 <i>Causes of International War</i> G. Lowes Dickinson.....Page 78 College NotesPage 79</p>
---	---

Our Contributors

<p>OLON De LEON. Editor <i>The Advance</i>, organ of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.</p> <p>BABETTE DEUTSCH. Author of "Banners," etc.</p> <p>ALEXANDER FICHANDLER. Educational Director, International Garment Workers' Union.</p> <p>WILLIAM Z. FOSTER. Organizer of Packing House and Steel Workers; author of "The Great Steel Strike and Its Lessons"; Secretary of Trade Union Educational League.</p> <p>ISAAC A. HOURWICH. Statistician; author of "Immigration" and other works; legal adviser, Russian Soviet Bureau.</p>	<p>DAVID S. MUZZEY. Professor of History, Barnard College.</p> <p>J. B. SALUTSKY. Educational Director, Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union.</p> <p>ART SHIELDS. Laborer, Writer and I. W. W. Organizer in far West and East.</p> <p>H. G. TEIGAN. General Secretary, National Nonpartisan League.</p> <p>FRANCIS TREAT. Associate editor of <i>Clarté</i>.</p> <p>B. CHARNEY VLADECK. Business Manager, <i>Jewish Daily Forward</i>; Socialist Alderman, N. Y. City.</p> <p>VIOLA WHITE. Winner, 1920, of Yale University Poetry Prize for Younger Poets.</p>
---	--

THE SOCIALIST REVIEW

Vol. X.

APRIL-MAY 1921

No. 2

The Future of the Review

IN December, 1919, *The Socialist Review* made its first appearance in the field of American journalism. During the past year and a half it has sought to keep its readers informed concerning the sweep of the socialist and labor movement here and abroad and to furnish a common ground on which the extremes of socialist thought and aspiration might meet and present their respective positions to the world of labor.

Past Achievements

That the *Review* has set a new standard in socialist and labor periodicals in this country is unquestioned.

"To me," declared Louis Untermeyer, a short time ago, "it seems one of the few journals of information that is indispensable." "The *Review* is the best open forum of the written word wherein all workers in the labor and radical movement may educate or be educated" is the opinion of Toscan Bennett. While Professor Wesley C. Mitchell of the New School for Social Research has pronounced it "the most scholarly and fair-minded journal" devoted to socialism that has come his way.

Hosts of commendations of a similar nature have been received during the past few months. To students of the labor and socialist movement, and to men and women in the heat of the struggle on the economic and political fields the magazine has furnished an understanding of the big events in the world of labor which has been of inestimable value.

The *Review* during its brief career has not only discussed all phases of the movement toward industrial democracy in this country, but has presented illuminating articles on the labor and socialist situation in

Great Britain, Belgium, France, Spain, Italy, Germany, Russia, Australia, Japan, South America and other lands.

It has counted among its contributors such internationally known writers and economists as

Henri Barbusse, Edwin Markham, Charles P. Steinmetz, Louis Untermeyer, Vida D. Scudder, Morris Hillquit, Arthur Gleason, René Marchand, Harriot Stanton Blatch, John Haynes Holmes, W. Jett Lauck, Paul Vaillant-Couturier, Arthur Le Sueur, Duncan MacDonald, Sylvia Pankhurst, F. W. Pethick-Lawrence, Walter N. Polakov, Emile Vandervelde, Ordway Tead and Harold J. Laski. And all of its contributions have been given without money and without price.

Although every issue increased the friends of the *Review*, it became evident in the summer of 1920 that the monthly could not hope to continue and attain the largest degree of usefulness as a part of the work of the Inter-collegiate Socialist Society. For it was impossible for the Society to do justice to its other activities, and, at the same time, to give adequate financial support to a monthly periodical. The friends of the magazine were thus forced to the conclusion that, if the *Review* was to live up to its possibilities, it should be controlled by a publication company the main business of which was the running of a magazine; that the policy of the *Review* should be determined by representatives—official and unofficial—of the advanced labor, socialist and other groups; and that, while the more narrowly socialist problems should not be ignored, far more attention should be given to the problems of labor unionism—problems of increasing importance with every passing day.

Labor Takes a Hand

In the Fall of 1920, acting upon this convic-

tion, and with the hearty approval of the I. S. S., the editors asked a group of labor unions in New York to send delegates to a conference to discuss the formation of a labor publication society to be controlled, for the most part, by representatives of labor and socialist groups. The response of the unions was a most encouraging one, and, after a series of conferences, a Labor Publication Society was formed which gives promise of great possibilities.

The character of the support thus far obtained may be judged from mere mention of the active spirits in the publication company. The Board of Directors for the first year include, for instance,

S. John Block; William E. Bohn; Alfred J. Boulton, N. Y. Stereotypers' Union; J. M. Budish, Chairman, United Labor Education Committee; Evans Clark, Director, Labor Bureau; Max D. Danish, Assistant Secretary, International Ladies Garment Workers Union; Herman De Frem, Vice-President, Associated Teachers' Union; Arthur Gleason, Director, Bureau of Industrial Research; Isaac A. Hourwich; William H. Johnston, President, International Machinists Association; Harry W. Laidler; J. S. Lieberman, labor organizer; A. J. Muste, Secretary, Amalgamated Textile Workers Union; Joseph Schlossberg, General Secretary, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; Alexander Trachtenberg, Bureau of Statistics, International Ladies Garment Workers Union; and Leo Wolman, Lecturer, New School for Social Research; Jessica Smith.

The incorporators of the new review are

Edmond Gottesman, Neckwear Workers; J. T. De Hunt, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks; Louis Langer, Joint Board of Cloakmakers, I. L. G. W. U.; Max Golden, Millinery and Ladies Straw Hat Workers; David J. Saposs, New York Educational Director, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; and Isidor Reich, United Cloth Hat and Cap Makers.

While other well-known men and women who have actively served on the Reorganization Committee include

Morris Hillquit, Florence Kelley, Charles Ervin, Harriot Stanton Blatch, Charney Vladeck, Louis B. Boudin, James Oneal, Alexander Fleisher, Savel Zimand, and, as representatives of organized labor, Abraham Shiplacoff, Secretary of the New York Joint Board of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers; James H. Maurer, President of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor; J. B.

Salutsky, Educational Director, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; Fannia M. Cohn, Secretary Educational Department, International Ladies Garment Workers; A. Sachs, Workmen's Circle; I. Silverman, District Council, Painters, Decorators and Paper Hangers; M. Feinstone, Secretary, United Hebrew Trades; I. Laderman, Fancy Leather Goods Workers; and Anna Kronhardt, Joint Board, Waist Makers, International Ladies Garment Workers.

An informal vote of the Reorganization Committee favored "The Age of Labor" as the name of the reorganized monthly. The name will be finally decided upon at the membership meeting to be held in the near future.

The Policy of the Reorganized Review

The *Review*, as reorganized, will wholeheartedly support a program of social ownership and democratic control of industry. It will strive to unite in support of this program the largest possible groups in the socialist and labor movement. To serve this purpose it will not take an editorial position on subjects of controversy within the movement. It will not stand for any one group or faction or theory. It will endeavor to become a meeting place for all the more earnest, forward-looking elements. The policy as tentatively formulated by the Reorganization Committee is as follows:

"The *Review* believes that the goal of the labor movement lies in the development of a system of production for service instead of for private profit. It believes that this is to be attained through the social ownership and democratic management of industry.

"As paths to this goal, *The Review* favors the organization and strengthening of the workers by hand and brain on the economic field, through labor unions and cooperative enterprises; on the political field, through independent political movements; on the educational field, through workers' educational efforts.

"The *Review* will support all efforts on the part of labor to develop the solidarity of the workers within the nation and with workers of all other nations, to the end that the exploitation of class by class may cease, and that labor may come into its own.

"The *Review* will stand for the whole working class, and its chief effort will be to draw together all groups and sections of opinion within the labor movement by furnishing a forum where all groups

may freely speak their minds. It will endeavor to serve the cause of labor by furnishing information and discussion with regard to matters of vital interest for all sections of the labor movement.

"*The Review* will seek to give particular attention to the labor movement, to labor union problems, to workers' education, to coöperative efforts, to the progress and problems of the Socialist and other independent parties of producers here and abroad, and to international relations."

New Problems of Labor

Never has an American labor monthly been launched with the backing of so powerful and varied a group of labor and socialist leaders. And never has it been possible for a labor and socialist monthly to play so vital a part in the labor movement as at the present time.

For the first time in America, the advanced labor unions are beginning vital experiments in workers' education, in consumers' and producers' coöperative enterprises. They are mobilizing their credit and establishing labor banks. They are tackling the problem of production standards. They are working out plans for democratic representation in industry. They are giving serious attention to independent political action, to research bureaus, to scientific methods of organization and publicity, to the technique of industry, to educational campaigns for social ownership, to the most effective methods of waging strikes, to labor news service, to plans for unifying labor at home and abroad, to the revolutionizing of the law toward labor combinations. They are planning to meet the employer's greatest drive against organized labor in America. Each of these new departures brings in its wake many difficult problems.

It will be the function of the monthly to keep labor informed concerning the experiments which organized labor the world over is making along these lines. And whenever there is a vital difference of opinion within the ranks of the advanced labor movement on these problems, the *Review* will strive to give the American worker the advantage of the various points of view. Labor may thus be saved many unnecessary failures and may be inspired to follow those lines of action

which promise the greatest hope of success.

Socialist Problems

There are also the pressing problems in the socialist movement—the relation of the American movement to the Third International, the importance of direct action as compared with political action, the practical working out of the principle of democratic management in industry, the question of proletarian dictatorship, the relative advantages of occupational and geographical representation, and many similar questions. The reorganized *Review*, in throwing its pages open to the discussion of these questions from various points of view, should prove an invaluable aid to the progress and solidarity of this movement.

Discussion of labor union and socialist problems in the same magazine will have this additional advantage: it will give to the labor unionist a valuable grasp of the problems of socialism; to the socialist movement, a needed insight into the concrete, practical issues facing the labor unions, and to the student of the subject a comprehensive view of the whole struggle of labor on the economic and political fields toward a new order of society.

What Can You Do?

The first issue of the reorganized *Review* will appear just as soon as we have money enough in sight to give reasonable assurance of permanency. We ask all friends of the *Review* to communicate with the present staff and pledge their coöperation in making this magazine of the greatest possible service to social progress. We want members for the Labor Publication Society; we want men and women who will make it their business to boost the sales of the magazine; and, at present, we want, most of all, generous contributions toward the financing of the monthly. We urge all who possibly can to send us at once a personal pledge toward the new venture, and to secure pledges and contributions from labor and other groups. Send us a letter and promise of coöperation today.

H. W. L.

What Ails American Radicalism?

William Z. Foster

WHENCE comes the notorious weakness of radicalism in all its phases in the United States? How comes it in particular that, while in all other important capitalistic countries radicals stand at the head of the labor movement and dominate its policies, here in this country the conservatives and reactionaries are in almost complete control? These are vital questions, pressing for an answer.

Many reasons have been brought forth to explain this condition. The heterogeneous character of our population, we are told, makes mutual understanding and united action unusually difficult for the workers. The democracy (sic) of our customs and institutions naturally checks the growth of class feelings and ideas. The opportunities presented for many years by the vast stretches of free land and the tremendous industrial expansion have constantly sapped the labor movement by drawing from its ranks thousands of those intelligent, restless, ambitious spirits who are always the heart and soul of every working-class protest. No doubt all these things have been of some influence in hindering the growth of American radicalism. Another factor, however, far more important than all of these combined, is to be found in the unscientific and impractical economic program of our radical movement. In fact, this program has literally paralyzed radicalism in this country.

What this program is may perhaps best be understood by way of comparison: The normal course for radicals to take—and the one they have taken in practically every country where the revolutionary movement is really a factor—is to remain in the old, conservative trade unions and gradually to impress upon these organizations radical policies and structure. Thus radicals have won the leadership of the masses. This is the evolutionary method of development.

The Policy of Dualism

In the United States, however, an opposite course has been followed. Here the pronounced tendency has long been for the radicals to withdraw from the old craft unions and to set up industrial unions in opposition to them. It is a policy of separatism, of dualism. Many radicals, it is true, have objected to this method, preferring to work within the trade unions. But the weight of the radical movement has been against them. Its heart has been in the dual industrial union program, and that is where it has thrown the overwhelmingly greater part of its strength. It is the catastrophic method, a method which has certainly led to a catastrophe, but not of the kind expected.

This dual industrial union policy has been in effect for about thirty years. During that time dozens of radical organizations have been launched to give it flesh and blood—I could name fourteen of them affecting the railroad industry, including the American Railway Union and the Industrial Workers of the World, the latter of which covers all industries. Thousands of devoted militants have made great sacrifices to forward these dual unions. But to no avail. Not one of these organizations has succeeded in gaining a real grip in the industries. When compared with that of the trade unions, the combined membership of all of those now in existence is almost negligible. Thus for a generation virtually the whole radical movement has been wasting itself on utopian union projects. It has divorced itself from the masses and has failed to win their leadership. That is why it is such a small factor, politically and industrially. Dual industrial unionism—that is the principal ailment of American radicalism.

The Case of the Amalgamated

It is often argued that the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America is an exception to the general failure of dual unions—in fact, this splendid organization is commonly cited

as the great justification of the dual industrial union policy. But this is an error. The facts show that the Amalgamated is not a product of their idolized policy.

In the first place, regardless of its philosophy and tendencies, the Amalgamated is not an industrial union. It is essentially a craft union, like the International Ladies Garment Workers, the Hatters, Cap Makers, Journeymen Tailors, Fur Workers, etc.—all of which go to make up the needle industry. And it may be remarked that the success of the Amalgamated is partly due to the fact that it is a craft union. Had it been started as a dual industrial union of needle trades workers, it would have had to face the united opposition of the above-mentioned powerfully organized unions, which would probably have been fatal. As it was, it recognized the craft jurisdiction of these unions and enjoyed their hearty and helpful support, especially valuable in its early and critical days.

Nor is the Amalgamated a dual union in the sense that radical unions commonly are. The latter voluntarily set themselves up against the old trade unions as a matter of principle. The Amalgamated did not. The men who founded it, no doubt feeling that evolution in the United Garment Workers would take the same course as it did in the other needle trades unions, and gradually place the radicals in control, set out to "capture" their organization. They had no outside union; they stuck to the old one. And so successful were they that they soon had the mass of the membership on their side. At the fateful Nashville convention they controlled a majority of the delegates, but the old guard, in a desperate effort to retain control for a while longer, ruled out a number of these radicals. This caused a split, but still the militants were determined to remain within the fold. They called themselves the United Garment Workers, claiming to be the genuine organization, and they went to the A. F. of L. convention to make their claim good. It was only when their application was denied that they definitely launched out as a new organization, taking with them the bulk

of the United Garment Workers' membership.

How different this system was from that commonly followed by radicals may be seen by a comparison. Were the militants in the railroad unions to do as they did in the United Garment Workers, it would mean for them to go out and deliberately to secure control of a majority of the men and organizations, aiming to get control of the whole group. But do they do that? Not a bit of it. Their policy is to draw out of the old unions and forthwith to devote themselves to outside organizations. Had the militants in the men's ready-made clothing trade followed this foolish method it is doubtful indeed if the Amalgamated would ever have come to pass.

The Weakening Effect of Dual Unionism
The worst feature of the dual industrial union program is the disastrous effects it produces in the old unions. In them it poisons progress at the very source. A word as to how this occurs: It is a well known fact that ordinarily the life of trade unions is carried on by a very small number of militants, who probably constitute not over one per cent. of the whole membership. These active spirits do the practical work of the unions, and are the very life blood of the labor movement. They are the elements that first become radical, and where a rational economic program is in effect, the result of their becoming radical is vastly to increase their efficiency and value in the old unions. Imbued with renewed courage and intelligence, they make the whole trade union movement flourish and prosper, and incidentally also the radical movement at large.

But in this country it all works out differently. Here when this class of militants in our unions become radical, they at the same time get infected with the virus of dual unionism. Then, instead of having their efficiency increased in the old unions, it is practically destroyed altogether. They promptly lose all interest in their trade unions, and waste their great potential strength on the sterile utopian industrial unions current in their respective industries. Thus, in the course of many years, tens of thousands of these precious

militants have been sucked out of the old unions. The loss to the latter must have been tremendous. The wonder is not that the trade unions are making such slow progress, but rather that they have been able to live at all. If the trade union movement in this country is weak and conservative the radicals are chiefly to blame. For a generation they have kept a knife sticking in its heart. By pulling the militants out of the organized mass they have been literally severing the soul from the body of Labor.

Why Dualism Fails

A number of reasons might be advanced to show why dual industrial unionism fails. Let us cite but a couple of them: A fundamental cause is that the dual industrial program flagrantly violates the first principle of unionism, namely the solidarity of labor. Let us explain how: The foundation of labor unionism rests upon the grouping of all workers, regardless of the intellectual differences that otherwise divide them. The necessity for 100% organization imperatively establishes this condition. The place for all propaganda groups is within the bounds of the basic union. Hence, where the movement is normal, as in England for instance, we find anarchists, socialists, communists, Catholics, Protestants, atheists, craft unionists, industrial unionists, etc., all in the same organization. This results from a true working of the root principle of the solidarity of labor.

Should any of the intellectually homogeneous groups depart from this principle, and undertake to organize unions around its particular beliefs it is leaving the grounds of true unionism and sowing the seeds of disunion. This we see clearly in the case of the religious sects in various parts who set up "Christian" unions, and we rightly condemn the practice as highly reactionary. Yet our dual industrial unionists, who are such great exponents of the solidarity of labor, do almost the identical thing. They, too, leave the mass and attempt to organize a new movement upon the basis of their elaborate revolutionary conceptions. No matter that their

new unions profess to have as their *raison d'être* the common interests of the workers; the Christian unions urge the same thing. The inescapable fact is that in both cases the organizations are essentially built around certain ideas not held by the great masses. Both are in violation of the fundamental principles of unionism, and of the two types, I would unhesitatingly say that the dual industrial unions have done the more harm. In this country they have literally cut the heart out of the labor movement.*

The Road to Solidarity

Looking at the situation from a different angle: The dual industrial unions are essentially utopian. They ignore the natural evolution taken by labor unions in proving their conceptions, tactics and structure. For example: normally labor unions pass through three general stages of development, which I shall call (1) Isolation, (2) Federation, (3) Amalgamation. In the first, or isolation stage, the several craft groups, recognizing few or no interests in common, act independently of each other. Later, when they begin to get a better understanding of their mutual interests, they seek cooperation through a system of more or less loose alliances among the closest related trades, thus coming into the federation stage. And finally, with a ripening understanding, they inevitably make for still greater solidarity by entering the amalgamation stage and fusing together along the lines of their industry. Later the same course of development goes on as between the industrial unions thus built up. They, too, gradually come together.

* Consequent upon their first error in quitting the old unions because of intellectual considerations, the dual unionists naturally tend to split and split again as differences of opinion develop among them. Thus in the railroad industry we find five dual industrial unions, all representing different tendencies, all talking about the solidarity of labor, and all fighting each other as well as the old unions. And other industries present a similar condition. American radicals have reduced unionism to a question of sectarianism. It has almost come to the point where every time a rebel gets an economic headache he starts a new labor movement on the strength of it. The whole thing is tragically ridiculous. It marks the bankruptcy of the dual union program.

Dozens of industrial unions in Europe and elsewhere have grown in this evolutionary manner. It is the natural way to solidarity, and it is the course that American trade unions are going, however slowly. Our whole movement is now virtually in the federation stage of development. The railroad unions are a notable example. Their multitudinous system of divisional and national alliances constitute the most elaborate maze of federations ever constructed by any group of unions on the face of the globe. They are ripe for amalgamation. The clothing trades are typical. At the start the several crafts in the clothing industry operated separately. Now they are yielding to the need for industrial solidarity, and we see that they have just set up the needle trades alliances. This is a typical federation, and is only a preliminary to the inevitable amalgamation of the unions of the industry into one compact organization.

So, from stage to stage, goes the normal course of labor union development. But our dual unionists ignore it all. They have their spick and span, blue-printed, perfected organizations. And they ask an ignorant working class, habituated to craft unionism, to throw aside their old unions, built through forty years of strife and struggle, and to join themselves forthwith to the highly advanced type they propose. They would abolish the law of labor union development. That's all. Is it any wonder that the American radical movement stagnates, resting as it does upon such a bizarre and unworkable economic program?

A New Program Necessary

Recently Nikolai Lenin, in roundly condemning radicals who stay out the old trade unions and start dual organizations, characterized this utopian policy as a sort of children's disease of the labor movement. Now the trouble with the American radical movement is that it has suffered for many years from a severe attack of this economic measles. And it is high time that it pulled itself together. The situation demands the adoption of a new

program. The radicals should get into tune with labor union development; the dual union program should be finally and definitely discarded; the ideal of industrial unionism should be set up in the old unions, and then every practical measure applied looking towards its realization.

Nor can there be any doubt of the outcome. The "it-can't-be-done" stuff is rubbish. Leadership is bound to come to the radicals, and radical measures are bound to be followed. The radical has every advantage over the conservative in the unions. In the vital matters of energy, honesty, courage, idealism, and knowledge of the movement, he has, or should have, all the best of it. And the best proof of this is that all over the world he is gradually taking the leadership of the unions. If that has not happened here it is simply because the radicals have made no serious efforts. They have practically abandoned the unions to conservative leadership and programs.

Labor's Radical Past

The popular notion that the American workman is immune to radicalism will not bear investigation. What has been accomplished in Seattle and other places, where the radicals have been able to free themselves somewhat from the thrall of dual unionism, disproves it effectively. But the classic proof is to be found in the condition prevailing some thirty-five years ago. At that time the American labor movement was the most militant and radical then in existence. Here was first tried out the general strike idea, and here the eight-hour movement got its first real impetus. The great foment in 1884-6 attracted the attention of the whole world; international May Day grew out of it. The Knights of Labor and the trades unions were honeycombed with radicals. The American proletariat stood in the vanguard of the world's labor movement. This was as things should be in the greatest capitalist country.

In those days conditions were not so ripe for radicalism as they are now. The workers were not so receptive, nor were radicals

one-tenth so numerous. What then is the explanation of the great wave of radicalism, compared with the present stagnation? There is only one answer, and that is that in those days the dual union idea had not yet infected American radicals. Those old-time militants in their economic activities were not slaves to utopianism. They functioned naturally and consequently effectively. They took the unions as they found them and worked in harmony with their laws of evolution. They stayed with the masses, and inevitably became powerful leaders among them. They were the leaven that leaveneth the whole lump, as successful rebels must always be.

The Coming Renaissance

This period of radical leadership in the labor movement came to an end in the early nineties through the development of the dual union program by De Leon and others. At that time began the syphoning of the militants out of the old unions and into the sterile dual organizations. And from then on radical influence among the unions waned and

waned until now it is next to zero. For a time, recently, the "right" socialists made an effort to establish their militants in the trade unions; and they were very successful although they attacked the problem at the hardest spot, the American Federation of Labor convention. They came to control over one-third of the votes in that body. But the wave of dualism submerged the movement and it has practically dissolved.

Things are bad for radicalism in the United States now. Nor are they likely to get better until the movement rids itself of its old-man-of-the-sea, dual industrial unionism. When that is done, and done it inevitably must be, then we can look for a real renaissance in the labor movement. While the radicals have been wasting their efforts on experimental dual unionism, the old unions have been weak and neglected. Capitalism, taking advantage of the situation, has raced on practically unchecked and deeply intrenched itself. For the weak position of American Labor the radicals are chiefly to blame. The dual industrial union program must go.

Debs

Viola C. White

When the winds wake,
When the floods start,
I think of him who lives
In the people's heart.

He who lives there
Shall never know
The outcast road
That exiles go.

He who lives there
Shall ever be
Held on that heart
As a ship on the sea.

On its deep water
Brave and blest,
On its dark water
To take his rest.

When the winds wake,
When the floods start,
I think of him who lives
In the people's heart.

Labor's Answer to the Open-Shop Drive

William E. Bohn

AMERICAN labor allows the enemy to dictate its tactics. Organized capital chooses the field of battle and the weapons. Labor is on the defensive, thankful to escape defeat, gaining little when it wins. Never were the effectiveness of capital and the ineffectiveness of labor more glaringly displayed than in the open-shop drive.

This "drive" is a deliberate, well-organized plot. It began with the Associated Industries of Seattle during the summer of 1919. The name of this organization has since been adopted by countless similar groups throughout the country, and the propaganda matter used in Seattle has been imitated in many centers. In 1920 the Associated Employers of Indianapolis started an open-shop campaign of national scope. Within a short period they distributed 1,500,000 pieces of literature. They sent letters and circulars to open-shop groups everywhere urging them to watch legislation and suggesting types of advertising to be used. In the autumn of 1920 the National Association of Manufacturers established an Open-Shop Department. Because of its commanding position this organization has taken a leading part in the campaign since that time.

The United States Chamber of Commerce reversed its basic industrial policy in order to swing into line. This great body represents especially the small business men who belong to the local chambers of commerce. In part it speaks for the middle class. On this account it formerly maintained a neutral attitude toward industrial struggles. At the Atlantic City convention, held a year ago, a change was noticeable. Frederick Koster, a leader in the bitter struggle against union labor in San Francisco, attained commanding prominence. Last autumn, by referendum, this great national body adopted an open-shop resolution. This action had been foreshadowed in the part played by Mr.

Harry Wheeler in President Wilson's first Industrial Conference. Mr. Wheeler, a leader in the national Chamber of Commerce, served as chairman of the employers' group. In this position he used his influence against the indorsement of the right of collective bargaining and so helped to bring about the failure of the Conference.

A few cities and states have refused to take part in this national movement, but nearly all employers' groups throughout the country are in it. The uniformity of their pronouncements and methods everywhere suggests almost perfect mutual understanding and coöperation.

The "American" Plan

Minneapolis furnishes a typical instance. In October, 1920, its Civic and Commerce Association voted (2,120 to 125), for the open shop. According to the directors of this Association, "an open shop is one which is accessible on equal terms to all employes and applicants for employment without regard to membership or non-membership in labor unions, and in which the employer has the right to say that the employee shall not use his membership or non-membership in labor unions to the injury of the employer or fellow employees." That is, an open shop is one in which the union cannot function without the sanction of the employer, in which it might as well not exist, in which—on account of obvious inability to serve its members—it very soon would cease to exist. The Federation for Social Service of the Methodist Church is justified in saying that "the success of the present open-shop campaign would mean the establishment of a closed shop—closed against union labor—and would return large numbers of wage-earners to the living standards of sweated industries."

The managers of the drive play up the principle of "equal opportunity," "the square deal," "the American ideal of independence." Do they mean what they say?

Are they sincere? Before the Senate committee investigating the steel strike, Judge Gary testified that "of course workmen had the right to belong to unions," but that "it is my policy and the policy of the corporation not to deal with union labor leaders at any time." At the Lockwood Committee hearings in New York Mr. Untermeyer asked the following question of Mr. C. E. Cheney, secretary of the National Erectors' Association: "In all frankness, laying aside all subterfuge and looking at these minutes which you yourself have written at these conferences, you know, do you not, that the constant struggle and effort on the part of this Association was to equip each member with a non-union force?" Mr. Cheney replied, "Practically."

In its effect on employers this "American plan" is no more American than in its effect on the workers. Anyone interested in industrial matters can recall cases in which the operators of union shops have been coerced by fellow business men. The banks have refused credit or large consumers have refused to purchase union-made goods. It is the Lockwood Committee investigation, again, that furnishes the most modern instance. Mr. Grace, President of the Bethlehem Steel Company, testified frankly that it had been the policy of his concern to refuse delivery of steel to New York building contractors who employed union labor.

This drive against the unions is organized, financed, effective. Its plans are well worked out. Its publicity is nationwide. It utilizes every means from slander and flattery to brutal coercion. Denunciation of it, complaints against it, have as much force and cogency as German complaints against Foché or French denunciations of Hindenburg. In warfare a curse is a compliment.

The Washington Conference

During the last week in February American labor officials held a mighty conference in Washington. For once America had its eyes on labor. That fact in itself is significant. The publicity value of the conference was worth all it cost. And no doubt the vigorous

spirit engendered during the sessions sent every man back to his organization with a new determination. Among the things said and done some were marked by a vigor and dignity which has heartened the forces of labor across the continent.

But what was the upshot of it all? "The American labor movement, speaking through its authorized representatives . . . declares in measured and emphatic tones its unalterable determination to resist at every point and with its entire strength the encroachments both of industrial tyranny and of fanatical revolutionary propaganda." There was a good deal of this "speaking in emphatic tones." In the way of practical program there was a "bill of rights," a resolve to demand of Congress, in which "we" have thirteen "card men," a series of laws which are already in force in other civilized countries, to disregard anti-labor injunctions, and to establish a publicity bureau. This is labor's official answer to a devastating anti-labor drive. The publicity bureau, in the right hands, may become a mighty power. Let us hope so.

Labor Takes the Offensive

The only good defense is an offense. The fellow who begins the fight has the advantage of momentum. The gods fight with him. The Railway Brotherhoods organized the Plumb Plan League, chose their own ground and their own weapons. They got in motion and the other side had to look out for itself. The cries of pain and rage against them showed that their advance was well planned. They were fighting, not fighting back.

Many signs justify the prophecy that soon the Brotherhoods will not be fighting alone. Other union men are getting up their morale and studying objectives and plans of campaign.

Among these are the forty-three thousand members of District Number Two, United Mine Workers of America. In their convention, held down in Pennsylvania at exactly the same time as the Washington conference, they did not do much declaring in emphatic

tones. They set themselves in motion. With steadily mounting enthusiasm they adopted the Miners' Program. They asked themselves: "Has the policy of grievances and conciliation secured a good American life for the miner?" And they answered their own question: "Not yet. Not last year. Nor this year. Nor next year. Not while he is alive—it hasn't, it doesn't, it won't."

"In the past the miners have always been on the defensive. Everything they ask sounds like a demand and an exaction at the expense of the public. The way out is to throw the owners on the defensive by exposing profits and exposing mismanagement. Then, bring forward the larger program of the miners as a saving to the public. The public knows they are being 'stung.' They think the miners are stinging them. Show the public that the owners are stinging them."

"The labor movement must go forward or be smashed."

"Every strike to correct a grievance after this must mean an improvement in our status. We must never fight a grievance again except by heading it up into a larger program."

The Miners' Program

What is the program of the miners?

It is the program laid down by the 1919 Cleveland Convention of the Mine Workers of America.

Nationalization of the Coal Industry.

Six-Hour Day and Five-Day Week.

"But," said the 200 men representing District Number Two,

"That program will remain a pious hope and a vague aspiration until the rank and file know what the program means, why it is needed here and now, and how to get it. That means that the discussion in miners' locals must center around the program. It means a steady bombardment of facts. It means lifting the futile wrangling about grievances into a demand for fuller control. Each miner will then see his individual grievance as part of the district demand and the nation-wide demand. He will see that his own grievance will then have behind it the economic power of half a million miners. Only in this way will he ever get a cure for his grievance. And in getting that cure he will be pushing through a program which does away with all grievances."

"Our challenge to the present basis of the coal industry is this: The private ownership of the great natural resource of coal is morally indefensible and economically unsound. It means

that coal is mined for the comparatively few owners, instead of for the use and service of the public. It results in chronic mismanagement of the mines. It results in exploitation of the miner, through overwork, underpay, inadequate safeguards, bad housing, accidents, and long and unnecessary periods of enforced idleness. It results in unemployment when millions of consumers need coal. It results in high prices for coal when democratic methods of production would reduce cost, increase production and give a good American life to the miners."

"The miners' program could be progressively enacted inside of a few years if the miners willed it. But it is still a paper program, because it has not yet worked down into their consciousness. The facts are not known to them. They do not daily discuss it in their homes and in the local. They do not yet put into it the enthusiastic, intelligent interest which the owners put into crushing labor unions and retaining profits. At a district convention, the miners use more time in discussing a ten-cent increase in dues than in discussing a program which would make them free workers in a public service."

How to Do It

The campaign of education as adopted by the convention calls for the following machinery:

"1. Pamphlets for the miners on

- a. Car-pushing and How to Cure It.
- b. The Mismanagement of Coal Mines.
- c. Who Gets the Profits?
- d. What Nationalization Means to the Miners.
- e. The Miners' Next Step.
- f. What Mine Committees Have Done and What They Can Do.

"The distribution of pamphlets, leaflets, etc., will be made through the checkweighmen and presidents and secretaries of locals. These 800 officials can easily reach our 43,000 members."

"2. *Workers' Education.* This means the formation of groups of miners to meet regularly and discuss nationalization, workers' control, modern economic questions and other fundamental matters. Such groups in other industries have already been formed in several industrial centers in Pennsylvania. They are run by the department of education of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, with James Maurer as adviser."

"If the rank and file know the facts and how to act as a unit in changing conditions, they can obtain every just and reasonable demand. The weakness of labor is not because of the strength of the opposition on the part of owners. The weakness of labor is in our own indifference to

conditions under private ownership and autocratic management. When we as miners know what we want with a lively conviction we shall win.

"Somebody has got to begin this campaign of education. It never will start anywhere if it does not start somewhere. Our district is as good a starting place as there is in the country. . . .

"3. *A Labor Paper for the State of Pennsylvania.* At present there is no modern, progressive labor paper going into the home of each miner. Such a paper would discuss nationalization and workers' control in each issue. District Number Two should be ready with funds to back up and co-operate with James Maurer in his efforts to start a labor newspaper for Pennsylvania.

"4. *Research.* We need to use experts to collect the facts which lie around loose all over our district. One mine committee has learned how to dicker and take power better than another. But nobody else is any the wiser. There is no pooling of information. Within two years we could level up the whole district to the level of the bargaining power of the best committee if we collected the local knowledge and spread it over the fourteen counties of District Number Two.

"Some of the mine mismanagement is so flagrant that the mere exposure of the facts would put speed into our demand for public ownership.

"Such a campaign of education will make this district acquainted with itself. It will spread the movement to other districts. It will be the first practical step toward making the Cleveland program a reality. There will never be a real national miners' movement for nationalization until the districts start it.

"Here is the chance for District Number Two to show the way."

Leading the Way

Yes, here District Number Two shows the way to the working class of the entire nation. This program was not put over by a few leaders. It was eagerly discussed for two days by those 200 delegates. They put their minds and hearts into it. They have gone back home to work for it. This is working-class action.

Reports of the convention say nothing about the open-shop drive. Yet those miners gave the only right answer to that drive. The capitalist leaders have almost every strategic advantage. Their numbers are small and easily organized. Their class-consciousness is steady and effective. Their wealth and position give them control of pro-

fessional brains and powers of publicity. They have law and tradition and habit of domination on their side. The working class is a great divided, scattered mass only imperfectly class-conscious. The powers and principalities are against it. Its members are trained to suffering and docility. Its task is infinitely more difficult than that of the capitalist group and its equipment and preparation infinitely less. But it has the numbers, the ultimate sources of power. What it needs to put its power into motion is intelligence, imagination. So far it has failed to produce them. Even the most advanced sections have spent a good share of their time protesting and denouncing and complaining that the capitalists don't play fair.

At one stroke, apparently, District Number Two has cut loose from all this miserable business. They look one another in the face and say: "We want public ownership and democratic control of our industry. We will work steadily until every miner is back of this program. Then we will get what we want." If they really translate the spirit and intent of their convention group into terms of action on the part of the 43,000 members—then we shall hear the other side doing the protesting and denouncing and complaining. This is the real answer, the only right answer, to the open-shop drive.

The American Empire

The American Empire. By Scott Nearing. N. Y. Rand School. 1921. 266 pp.

This is our best propaganda book. If every socialist will push it, this volume will do for America what *Merrie England* did for England. It is filled with figures that give you a jolt, yet every page reads like a ripping good leaflet.

America, become a great empire, is preparing for a struggle against Great Britain. One of two things; either the organized workers will dominate America or they will be pushed into a war that will make the last one look like a preliminary skirmish. Scott Nearing's book brings the reader face to face with this alternative.

The Amalgamated Bears the Brunt

Solon De Leon

WHEN William H. Barr of the National Metal Trades Council said, a few days after the armistice, "War time wages must be liquidated," he sounded the keynote for the American employers' after-the-war attitude toward labor. Not only were wages to be slashed, but if possible the whole trade union movement was to be broken up and routed no less thoroughly than the Germans had been in the Argonne. Reconstruction, to the capitalists, was to mean above all else destruction to trade unionism.

Many leading employers, and their hired managers, have been to college. Either on the gridiron or on the bleachers they have had part in numerous football battles, and they know that the way to block a rush is to tackle and down the foremost men. In their attempt to smash American trade unionism the employers played football. They tackled the Amalgamated first.

Growth of the Amalgamated

The Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America had been established in 1915 as the result of overwhelming disgust on the part of the majority of American men's clothing workers with the reactionary leadership of the old men's garment workers' union attached to the American Federation of Labor. Within five years it had organized every important men's clothing market in this country and in Canada. New York, Chicago, Rochester, Boston, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Cleveland, St. Paul, Minneapolis, Montreal and Toronto—most of them places where no stable union in the industry had ever grown before—were added to the Amalgamated family. The membership neared the 200,000 mark. It included practically all the skilled workers in the trade, leaving to their old-line rival "only the overall makers," as one organizer expressed it. Wages were raised in every center. Working hours

were cut down from the unlimited time of the sweatshop to a standard forty-four-hour week throughout the country. The tidy sum of \$100,000—up to that time the largest strike contribution in labor history—was sent to the steel strikers. Joint representation in industry was won through the system of collective bargaining machinery in each center, with an impartial chairman paid by both sides.

The Amalgamated was honest. The Amalgamated was effective. It was independent, fearless, and progressive. Obviously, if American unionism was to be smashed, here was the place to start.

The Drive Against the Amalgamated

It is no mere surmise that powerful employers throughout the country are behind the drive on the Amalgamated. A leader of the New York clothing manufacturers is quoted as saying of the present fight: "Somebody else is paying the expenses. The manufacturers' association is not paying them. Somebody else is putting up the money."

Trouble in the New York market was felt to be brewing as far back as mid-summer of 1920. The industry had been slack. Men and women had been walking the streets for months. In the language of the trade, "There were no bundles." Since the employers had little to lose by shutting their shops, and perhaps had the death of a union to gain, the moment to pick a fight seemed opportune.

"Excessive labor costs" served as the employers' slogan. It was in line with what employers in every industry were crying. Moreover, the people who bought clothes were chafing at the scandalously high prices which prevailed. They could not know how much those prices were due to artificially created shortage, how much to swollen profits, how little to increases in wages. "Reduction of labor costs" was expected to rally to the employers' side that intangible ally known as public opinion.

On September 24th the manufacturers' association halved Wilson's famous program and adopted seven points, which were presented to the union one week later. The employers' seven sisters were:

"1. The right of the employer to install piece work.

"2. Scales prevailing in other clothing markets to be the base rates for New York workers.

"3. The co-operation of workers in maintaining individual records of production for week workers in shops and cutting rooms.

"4. Individual standards of production for week workers in shops and cutting rooms.

"5. The right of the manufacturers to change contractors.

"6. Adequate freedom to discipline and hire workers and to improve machinery.

"7. The agreements made by the unions in other markets in which adjustment machinery is functioning successfully to be made the basis of relationship between the association and the union."

In other words, what the employers wanted, in plain terms, was the slave-driving system of piece work, unlimited power to "hire and fire," and reduced wages.

Investigate, Says Labor

The union has always stood for joint representation in industry. Were labor costs too high? Were workers interfering with shop management? Very well, let a joint committee be selected. Let an impartial study of the industry be made. Let's get the figures on the table. If, on the other hand, labor costs were not excessive, and the workers had been behaving fairly toward the industry, current wages and administrative provisions would stand. Such a proposal was made by the Amalgamated to the Clothing Manufacturers' Association of New York. A series of conferences looking to its adoption were held.

But such an inquiry was the last thing a certain group of employers wanted. They were the Tirpitzes and the Hindenburgs of industry. They were for ruthless submarine warfare, the bombing of women and children, and the annihilation of the workers' organization at all costs. The manufacturers' peace party, represented by the labor manager for the association, Major Byres

Gitchell, was forced to resign. A notorious union fighting attorney was placed in charge of the situation. On December 2nd an ultimatum was sent to the union.

That ultimatum declared that the association would "continue the conference with the union for the purpose of fixing conditions of labor," providing that the union would, in effect, previously agree to all that the employers' war party had asked. Attached to the ultimatum was a statement that if, by December 6, the date set for its expiration, the union had not yielded to the demands, "then the association shall put into effect the proposal aforesaid."

There was no mistaking the purpose of that ultimatum. It demanded of the union things which the union had suffered and sacrificed to gain, and which it could not give up without giving up itself. It purposely insisted on points which the employers knew the union would never, and could never, yield as long as it was a union. The ultimatum was therefore a frank avowal of war to the knife against the workers' organization.

The Ultimatum

In such wise it was received by the membership. Their little savings depleted by months of part time and no time, faced by a winter of no one knew how great severity, they gathered in sixteen crowded mass meetings in New York, Brooklyn, and Newark, to learn the latest word from the seat of negotiations. Fiery youth was there, and resigned old age; stripling strength and woman's weakness. They poured up the stairs and jammed the aisles and stewed in their overcoats and shawls while the discussions went on. But when the terms of the ultimatum were read, one simultaneous roar of "No!" went up from every throat. Two days later the lock-out was put in force by the employers, and 60,000 workers were told they could not earn a living without making concessions which amounted to abandoning the union that alone had made the industry livable for them.

The response of the members in the rest of the country was immediate and unflinching. At a meeting of executive officers and representatives from a dozen cities, on December 18 and 19, an International Lock-Out Resistance Fund of \$1,000,000—the largest union defense chest ever known—was voted, to be raised by voluntary assessments. The New York organization hired halls for its locked-out members, arranged its picket lines, and opened co-operative grocery stores for the distribution of relief.

To Labor's Defense

Of the \$1,000,000 fund, more than three-quarters has already been raised. Nearly half of that has come from one city, Chicago, where no more than ten years ago the unorganized workers supinely did the work which New York employers sent there in time of strike. Probably no other organization than the Amalgamated could have started the struggle with its pockets empty, and in the midst of a general industrial slump have raised a fund like that.

Though themselves out of work for many weary weeks, the Amalgamated women of Baltimore conceived the idea of raising a special milk fund for babies of the New York members. By the middle of March they had raised more than \$1,000 for this purpose in addition to paying the regular assessments.

The employers did their level best to drag every other clothing center in the country into their lock-out fight. They have ingloriously failed. In Chicago the largest clothing shop in the country, where the Amalgamated joint adjustment machinery was first set up, refused to unsettle relations. While work in Chicago has been somewhat slow, due to the country-wide depression, the shops have been open to the union in so far as there were orders.

In Baltimore the war policy of the employers scored a similar brilliant failure. There the second largest clothing firm in America, a few weeks after the New York struggle began, renewed its old union agreement with one or two minor changes. As

the fall season approaches and new work starts, Baltimore will be completely on its feet.

In Boston the employers fared better. They were able to induce the clothing manufacturers' association there to abrogate the agreement. Pickets have been arrested on serious, and when these failed, trivial, charges. A new police flivver named "galavanting Kate" was christened in a raid on Amalgamated pickets. Work has been taken to outlying towns, only to be followed by Amalgamated members in automobiles. The upshot of the struggle is that more than half of the Boston association shops have had to sign up again with the union, and the rest are expected to follow soon.

In Philadelphia the members found out that New York work was being slipped over on them by means of false billing tags and other devices. They held a thronged mass meeting, made final representations to their employers on the subject, and early in March struck, more than 6,000 strong, to see that the practice was stopped.

Gradual Recovery

Meanwhile the industrial pendulum seems to be swinging toward recovery. Trade is opening up. Orders are coming in, despite surreptitious attempts by the manufacturers to induce the retailers to hold off until the New York struggle is settled. Even in New York some big association houses have settled, and many independents. Fully a quarter of the 60,000 people who were locked out in December are now back at work. The more workers there are, the more the defense fund rolls in, the more determined the union morale, while the manufacturer who keeps his plant shut sees the work going elsewhere. The lock-out employers are desperate.

The measure of their desperation is found in their rush to their last weapon to defeat the workers—the courts. Instead of suits of clothes they are getting suits at law.

Resort to Courts

Altogether eight damage suits aggregating

more than \$2,000,000 have been launched against the union, most of these directly in connection with the New York situation. The damages asked in individual cases vary from \$100,000 to \$500,000. In addition to the damages, permanent injunctions against strike activities, and finally the dissolution of the union, have been asked.

Some of these injunctions have been granted, and others may follow. That they will materially alter the situation is, however, hardly thinkable. One may be forbidden to picket a struck plant, but he can, in peace time, at least, hardly be compelled to work for an employer who seeks to knife him and his union. The Amalgamated is practically 100 per cent organized in the New York mens' clothing industry. There are no efficient strike-breakers to be had.

As to the suits for dissolution of the union, it is difficult to predict. We have gone a long way since the days of Edward and

Good Queen Bess when the penalty for a combination to raise wages was to have one's ears cropped. Even the conspiracy cases of 1800 to 1810 in this country are far in the rear. The right to organize is admitted even in Kansas, where the right to strike is not. Unless brute force by the employers is to turn the cycle of history a full century back, it seems inconceivable that any plea for the legal annihilation of a trade union can now be seriously entertained. The law-suits against the Amalgamated appear to be exactly what President Sidney Hillman of the organization called them, blunderbusses to scare the workers and to keep up the morale of those employers whom their present leadership is endeavoring to coerce into a fruitless and losing attack.

The Amalgamated is bearing the brunt of the employers' onslaught for the whole American Labor movement. And the Amalgamated has that most admirable habit in a trade union—the habit of winning.

Laundry

Babette Deutsch

Behind the frosted panes as white as lighted ice
 They worked like ghosts in hell far-seen from paradise.
 The shadowy fingers moved, the shadowy heads were bowed
 Like shadows cast upon a sheet that was their shroud.
 Though their dumb shadow-show were mockery of the dead,
 Though each worked out the woe each called upon his head,
 Though they were but the sign of slaveries long forgotten,
 They dug a bitter root, whose fruit is sweet, and rotten.

Workers' Education: Why and What?

Alexander Fichandler

AT this time there is little need of proving that workers have economic interests different from those of other social groups. The necessity for organization is undebatable. The one great problem is how to convince the unorganized, inarticulate masses that their salvation lies in organization and intelligent use of their economic power.

The foregoing answers the question, *Why Workers' Education?* Why any sectarian education? Is not the education which is offered to all by day and evening public schools, public lectures, museums, etc., sufficient? Does it not train workers to use their collective power effectively?

It is evident to thoughtful observers that the answer is an emphatic no. It is true that the foregoing agencies offer instruction in all sorts of subjects. But it is equally true that none of these is calculated to give workers an intelligent understanding of their own social and economic problems. They either ignore the fact that the interests of workers are different from those of wealth owners, or attempt to convince the workers that they are identical.

The result is that there has been developed among the workers a mistrust of the education provided by these agencies. In many cases, they feel that they cannot obtain in non-workers' educational institutions correct information on subjects affecting their own interests. They feel that they are frequently deceived and are furnished with interpretations of life which are intended to keep them docile and submissive. They feel that the truth will be told to them only by those of their own choosing, whose outlook on life is their outlook on life, whose sympathies are their sympathies, whose interests are their interests.

Hence we have Workers' Colleges established in many places, increasing in influence and reaching larger numbers of workers.

What We Should Not Teach

It is more difficult to answer the question, "What should the Workers' College teach?" Should its curriculum embrace the entire field of human knowledge? Should it teach cultural as well as other subjects? Should it be concerned only with what is of immediate benefit to the worker?

Perhaps the answer may be best reached by the process of elimination.

There is agreement among students of this subject that Workers' Education should not concern itself with purely vocational training. There is no doubt that this increases their efficiency. But it is frequently gained on the job, or in agencies provided by employers. There is no reason why workers as such should devote any of their comparatively slender resources to this kind of education.

How about the arts? Should workers' organizations provide good music for their members? There is no denying that workers should have all the beauty that the world has to offer, including music. But is it necessary to draw on workers' savings for this? In large cities, workers can go to the opera at a comparatively low cost. They could not by any means finance such splendid performances as are given in the opera houses. Similarly, they can hear the best symphonic music played by magnificent orchestras at extremely low prices. They can also hear pianists, violinists, singers and other musicians just as reasonably and frequently. So why employ the limited energies of the working class movement on such enterprises?

Similarly with painting, sculpture, etc. Splendid museums and art exhibitions are available to workers. Art knows not of class distinctions. It appeals equally to rich and poor. Workers can satisfy their love for beauty in existing institutions. Clearly it would be a regrettable expenditure to un-

dertake such enterprises exclusively for workers.

As for art education, workers can obtain it today in existing art schools. Drawing, painting, sculpture, etc., are the same whether taught in a capitalist or a workers' school. It is obvious that the latter need not concern itself with this.

How about science? Should mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, etc., be taught in Workers' Colleges? This may be answered by another question. Is workers' mathematics, physics, etc., different from the employers' mathematics, physics, etc.? What is to be gained if a worker studies algebra in workers' college instead of elsewhere? Will what he learns in the former be of greater help to him as an organized worker aiming at the emancipation of labor, than what he learns in the other kind of school? The facts of science are the same for all. Their interpretations have no social or economic significance. It is clearly an unnecessary drain on the facilities of Workers' Educational Institutions to provide instruction in these branches of knowledge.

Consider now the subject of literature. Should the workers' schools teach them to appreciate the beauties of Keats' *Ode to a Grecian Urn*, or Shelley's *Skylark*, or Shakespeare's *Sonnets*, and other similar works of art? It is true that workers should learn to enjoy these, and thus enrich their lives. But this can be done elsewhere just as well. Appreciation of beauty knows no class distinction. There is no capitalistic sunset to be tabooed by the proletariat.

What We Should Teach

It is different, however, with literature which interprets life as it is, particularly in relation to social problems. There is decidedly room in Workers' Schools for Shaw, Galsworthy, Hauptmann, Anatole France, Roland, Barbusse, Tolstoy, Gorky, Ibsen and others of that sort. In the works of these writers, there is criticism and inspiration, a challenge to the existing order and a mes-

sage of reconstruction. There is no doubt that they should be interpreted for workers by workers themselves.

And now we come to what might be called the social sciences: history, economics, sociology, geography, applied psychology, etc. Here we strike an entirely different ground. Even superficial observation will show that non-workers' schools do not tell all the facts in these subjects, and conceal from workers, sometimes deliberately and sometimes not, much of what they should know about themselves and their problems.

The worker should know the facts of history, even though they may contradict the accepted myths which largely compose the so-called history taught in most educational institutions. He should know the story of his own class and of the movement to protect his interests. He should understand the actual operation of our economic structure, instead of accepting reiterated orthodox justifications of the status quo. And similarly with other sciences which deal with our political, social and economic order. In these, he should be told the truth, particularly in reference to the life and interests of the working class. Needless to say, it is only in workers' schools that this demand can be met. It is hopeless to look elsewhere.

It may therefore be asserted that Workers' Schools should limit themselves to instruction in the social sciences and literature of social significance. The workers should obtain there such knowledge and training as will inspire them to seek to rebuild Life for the happiness of all, and as will enable them to accomplish this purpose with skill and effectiveness.

In short, workers are humans and require a great many things to make their life full and rich. Some of these they can obtain from existing institutions. Let them utilize them. Others they can obtain only from institutions organized and controlled by themselves. Let them create these.

Is the Proletariat the Majority?

Isaac A. Hourwich

ALL movements heretofore have been movements of minorities or in the interests of minorities. The proletarian movement is an independent movement of the enormous majority."

This is from the "Communist Manifesto" of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. Prior to the Bolshevik revolution in Russia this statement was the cornerstone of orthodox Marxism. It was accepted as a fact that the proletariat constitutes the majority of the population of every capitalistic country, and from this axiom was derived the political theory of the orthodox Social Democracy. If the proletariat is the majority of the community, it follows that in a democratic state with universal suffrage the proletariat has the power to elect the government. Having secured control of the whole machinery of government, it can by lawful means carry out the program of the Social Democracy. Of course, if the capitalists should attempt a counter-revolution, then the socialist government will suppress the counter-revolution with the power of the army, precisely as the government of the United States suppressed the "rebellion" of the Confederacy.

The Bolshevik revolution dealt a heavy blow to that theory. In Russia the proletariat is only a minority,—this fact is not disputed by either the Bolsheviks or the anti-Bolsheviks, and it is this minority that seized the political power and established a dictatorship of the proletariat. It is true, the proletariat is supported by the peasantry, and the proletariat together with the peasantry constitute the "enormous majority" of the Russian people. But the governing Communist Party does not wholly rely upon the political ally of the proletariat, the peasantry, but has so apportioned the representation in the Soviets that the proletarian minority alone should control the majority in all central bodies, whereas the peasantry, i.e.,

the majority, should be allowed only a minority in the representative bodies. This is the essence of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Communists and Democracy

The Communist Parties of all countries, and even the Socialist Center, have accepted the new formula,—the dictatorship of the proletariat through the Soviets, and have renounced "democracy" in the sense in which that term had been understood in all socialist platforms prior to the Bolshevik revolution.* At times the old word "democracy" is still used, but a new meaning is read into it. In the discussion of the 21 points many communist leaders have outspokenly declared against democracy and in favor of dictatorship.

The opponents of the communists accuse them of having "betrayed" their former principles. Such a charge can be made only in the heat of factional strife. The truth is that experience has demonstrated to the communists that even in the most highly developed capitalistic countries (except, perhaps, England) the proletariat is as yet not the majority of the adult population. Therefore, the proletariat is as yet powerless to establish socialism through the machinery of democracy. The proletariat is accordingly faced with the alternative of postponing the establishment of socialism until the course of capitalistic development will raise it to a majority of the population, or of seizing the powers of government by an uprising of an armed minority, and establishing a dictatorship which does not need the support of the majority of the voters.

* In the program of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party which was adopted at the convention of 1903, "the immediate political aim" is declared to be the establishment of a "Democratic Republic," which must be founded on "a universal equal and direct suffrage of all voters."

The American Proletariat: 1870-1900

In the United States the belief still persists that the proletariat does constitute a majority of the population. The present writer has challenged this belief. He has calculated on the basis of census statistics that the proletariat, including hired farm laborers, during the period of 1870-1900, increased from 40.9% to 44.6% of all persons engaged in gainful occupations. Considering the industrial proletariat alone, we find that it increased during the same period from 24.4% to 34.8% of the total number of persons engaged in gainful occupations.*

On the basis of a statistical analysis of the relative numerical strength of the proletariat compared with other groups of the self-supporting population, the present writer formulated the following conclusions:†

"1. The industrial wage-working proletariat forms but a minority of the self-supporting population of the United States.

"2. For a generation to come it is likely to remain such a minority.

"3. Only in a minority of the states does it form a majority.

"4. For some time to come it will form a minority in the majority of the states.

"5. It forms a majority of the urban population.

"6. Yet, even in some of those states or parts of states where it forms a majority of the whole population, it may be reduced to a minority of the voting population by the presence of a large proportion of unnaturalized aliens, or by the disfranchisement of the Negro.

"7. As far as can be foreseen, there is no prospect of the industrial wage-working class becoming a majority in three-fourths of the states required for amending the Constitution of the United States."

Two Classifications

The preceding analysis was made previous to the Census of 1910. Since that time the Census of 1920 was taken, but its results will not be published for some time to come. The

* "Social Economic Classes of the Population of the United States," *Journal of Political Economy*, Volume 19 (1911), pages 188-215; 309-337.

† "Social Economic Classes in the United States," *The New Review*, March 22, 1913, page 370. (Signed "Isaac Halevy.")

figures of the Census of 1910 relating to the class divisions of the American people have been treated by Professor Hansen of the University of Minnesota in the last issue of the quarterly of the American Statistical Association.* The division into classes adopted by him is in substance identical with the present writer's classification. The results of both calculations for the period of 1870-1900 are practically identical.

Professor Hansen includes in the capitalist class not alone the capitalists, but also their "retainers," to use a term made popular by Mr. Ghent. To determine which of the various social-economic groups may be properly included under the designation of "labor" or "capital," says Professor Hansen:—

"A merely mechanical classification on the basis of industrial status will not suffice. The classification to be realistic must be based to a certain extent on industrial psychology. As Hoxie put it, those 'who feel that their interests are identical with those of the employers, whose motives, habits of thought, social attitudes and sympathies are in harmony with the mass of employers belong to the employing class.' . . . The lower salaried employes, although sometimes worse off than the higher paid industrial wage-earners, will take their cue from their employers and imagine themselves to be a part of the 'business' world. There are indications that the above statement no longer holds for England, but for the United States, as far as the industrial conflict is concerned, this group may properly be placed with the proprietors and officials in the class referred to under designation 'capital.'"

Accepting this classification let us compare the figures of Prof. Hansen and of the present writer. The percentage ratio of industrial wage-earners in four census reports from 1870 to 1900 compare as follows:

Year	Hourwich	Hansen
1870	27.4	26.6
1880	29.5	30.4
1890	32.7	32.4
1900	34.8	35.3

The variations do not exceed a fraction of 1% and may be treated as negligible. Let

* Industrial Class Alignments in the United States. By Alvin H. Hansen, Quarterly Publication of the American Statistical Association, December, 1920.

us next compare the per cent. distribution of classes in the Census of 1900 according to both calculations:

Classes	Hourwich	Hansen
Farmers	20.4	19.8
Farm Laborers.....	13.3	15.2
Professional	5.2	5.4
Capitalist classes.....	14.8	10.8
Industrial wage-earners....	34.8	35.3
Servants	5.3	5.0
Unclassified	6.2	8.5
Total	100.0	100.0

Growth of the Proletariat, 1900-1910

The variation between these two calculations does not affect the substance of the classification. We may, therefore, compare Prof. Hansen's figures for 1910 with the present writer's figures for 1900.*

We shall only divide the group of farm laborers into "members of the family" and "wage earners," in accordance with the classification of the Census of 1910. The results of the comparison are shown in the following table:

Classes	1900	1910
Farmers	19.9	16.3
Farm Laborers:		
Members of Family.....	8.0	8.7
Wage Earners.....	7.1	7.4
Professional	5.4	5.4
Capitalist class.....	14.5	13.8
Industrial wage-earners.....	34.1	38.2
Servants	5.0	4.1
Unclassified	6.0	6.0
Total	100.0	100.0

The preceding table brings out quite clearly the changes which occurred during the decade 1900-1910. The farmers, including their children helping on the farm, decreased from 27.9% to 25%; the capitalists likewise decreased from 14.5% to 13.8%; servants also decreased from 5% to 4.1%. Increases

are shown by the industrial proletariat from 34.1% to 38.2%, and by hired farm laborers from 7.1% to 7.4%. In all, the proletariat increased from 41.2% to 45.6%. The ratio of the proletariat in 1910 was 10.7% above its ratio in 1900. If the industrial proletariat alone is considered, the ratio in 1910 was 12% above that in 1900. If the industrial development for the past 10 years since the census of 1910 has progressed at the same rate as during the preceding decade, the industrial proletariat today may be estimated at 42.8% of all breadwinners. The urban and rural proletariat together may represent about one-half of all persons engaged in gainful occupations.

It must be borne in mind, however, that the classes are not distributed in a uniform way throughout the several states and that the class distribution of women is quite different from that of men. If it be further remembered that there are a large number of unnaturalized immigrant wage-earners, then the number of proletarian voters will be seen to be, even today, far short of a majority of the voters in the United States.

Who is a Proletarian?

Of course the term *wage-earner* may be given such a broad interpretation as to include managers, superintendents and foremen of capitalistic enterprises, because they, also, are hired men who are paid for their services, and, on the other hand, farm laborers and servants. Looked at in that way the proletariat would appear to form a majority. It must not be lost sight of, however, that Marx's theory of the transition from capitalism to socialism does not rely upon wage-earners in general, but on wage-earners in large-scale industry who have been organized by the development of capitalism into an industrial army arrayed against a small number of capitalists. Hired laborers there were even before the capitalist era. A law clerk is also a hired man. But he considers his condition only as a temporary stage in his career. His aim is to become an independent practitioner, i. e.,

* I prefer to take my own figures for 1900 rather than those of Prof. Hansen, because I have made use of the census statistics of manufactures and mines, and I have thus succeeded in reducing the ratio of unclassified to 6%, precisely as in his calculation for 1910, instead of 8.5% as he has it for 1900. A more detailed analysis of the figures has convinced me that this makes a material difference.

an entrepreneur. For this reason he cannot be counted in the proletarian *class*. If all such wage-earners are eliminated, it appears that the genuine industrial proletariat of the United States represented in 1910 38.2% of all bread-winners. At present their number may be estimated at 42.8%.

Is the United States in an exceptional condition? What is the situation in European countries where the socialist movement has made greater strides than here? An answer to these questions will be given in the next number of the *Review*. In the meantime, what is the practical upshot of the situation revealed here in America?

Syndicalist, Communist, or Coalitionist?

The proletariat is not yet a majority in this highly developed industrial country. That means that the democratic political machinery which is operated upon the principle of majority rule furnishes to the proletariat no means to enact socialism. What, then, is to be done?

One answer is that although the proletariat lacks as yet the power to introduce socialism by political methods, it has already the economic power to eliminate the capitalist class from industry. This is the view of the syndicalists. The Italian metal workers attempted to act upon this theory last fall.

On the contrary, if it is believed that political means must be used to establish socialism, it cannot be brought about by the forces of the proletariat alone except through a dictatorship of the proletarian minority. This is the conclusion which has been quite logically arrived at by the communists. If that course is not feasible, we must either bide our time till the proletariat will have grown into a majority, or the proletariat must create a majority through a combination with non-proletarian elements. The latter course has been chosen by the socialist parties of Germany and Austria. The Socialist Party of Milwaukee has been considering the question of a combination with the

Farmer-Labor Party and the Farmers' Non-partisan League.

One can argue for and against every one of these three policies. But to cling to the old tactics, which were built upon the erroneous assumption that the proletariat is a large majority, means to condemn the American socialist movement to remain a perfectionist sect.

THE SOCIALIST REVIEW

Published Bi-monthly except June, July, August, September, by the

INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY

Educational Building, 70 Fifth Avenue,
New York, N. Y.

Editor, HARRY W. LAIDLER. Wesleyan.

Editorial Board

JAMES W. ALEXANDER.....	Princeton
EVANS CLARK	Amherst
W. HARRIS CROOK.....	Oxford
H. W. L. DANA.....	Harvard
LEWIS S. GANNETT.....	Harvard
FELIX GRENDON	Columbia
JESSIE WALLACE HUGHAN.....	Barnard
WINTHROP D. LANE.....	Michigan
F. F. ROCKWELL.....	Wesleyan
ALEXANDER TRACHTENBERG	Trinity

Contributing Editors

Louis B. Boudin, Stuart Chase, Arthur Gleason, Freda Kirchwey, John Haynes Holmes, Florence Kelley, Bruno Lasker, Caro Lloyd, James H. Maurer, Wm. P. Montague, S. Nuorteva, James Oneal, Harry A. Overstreet, Vida D. Scudder, Charles P. Steinmetz, Norman M. Thomas, Louis Untermeyer, and Savel Zimand.

The editor takes this opportunity to acknowledge the able assistance of Dr. William E. Bohn in the preparation of this issue and in the general work of reorganization. Dr. Bohn's enthusiastic cooperation has been an indispensable factor in the task of reorganizing the magazine.

SPECIAL OFFER

We have a few complete files left of *The Socialist Review* from December, 1919, to January, 1921, inclusive, for \$1.50 for U. S. A. Invaluable material. Send money order today. 70 Fifth Av., N. Y. City.

The Fight in North Dakota

H. G. Teigan

FIVE years ago North Dakota was a province of the predatory interests, a game preserve for the grain gamblers and money-lenders of Minneapolis, St. Paul and Duluth. Its banking laws, railway laws, grain grading and marketing laws were framed by outsiders for outsiders. During sessions of the legislature the private cars of Twin City lobbyists were regularly parked on the sidings at Bismarck.

Eighty-five per cent. of the state's population are farmers, and the remaining fifteen per cent. are nearly all dependent on the farmers. The farm is the only wealth producer in the state. North Dakota lost millions of dollars on every wheat crop. The grain was underweighed, undergraded and over-docked. The producer of the state's wealth discovered that he was working for nothing and boarding himself.

Prior to 1916 the people voted for the establishment of a terminal grain elevator by the state. The legislatures of 1913 and 1915 ignored the mandate of the voters. This flouting of the people's demands brought to Bismarck the famous "delegation in boots" and led to the founding of the Nonpartisan League.

Before the old regime realized what had happened, the League had captured every office in the state except one. That was in 1916. There was a hold-over majority in the Senate that blocked all legislation. In 1918 we secured a two-thirds majority in both houses. Then we were ready for business.

The 1919 Legislature

The legislature that convened in 1919 has one claim to undying fame: it kept every campaign promise! It passed 207 laws and adjourned several days before the statutory limit. There were five great reform measures on this program: state-owned elevators and mills, cheap hail insurance, a state-sup-

ported home-building scheme, exemption of farm improvements from taxation, and a state-owned and state-operated bank. Though the people had several times voted for this program, the enemies of our movement, ably financed by the great financial institutions of the Twin Cities, forced the principal measures to a referendum. In the referendum election, June, 1919, the League program was indorsed once more.

To the unsophisticated it would naturally seem that this would have ended the fight. But the real fight had just begun. Up to this point we had been having merely a preliminary skirmish. The main battle was still before us. There have been many phases of this contest. But our present over-advertised crisis has to do with the State Bank of North Dakota, so it is the story of this bank that I propose to tell.

The North Dakota Bank

To carry out its promise of rural credits at cost the legislature authorized the bank not only to furnish farm mortgage loans but also to lend money to any state institution that might require financing. The intent was to finance the chief industrial ventures by the sale of bonds, but the state bank was to be a second line of defence.

According to the law creating it all public funds (state, county, city and school district), were to be deposited with the bank. The bulk of these funds were redeposited in the private banks in the counties and cities from which the funds had come. Practically all of the local banks, of which we have 900, voluntarily made the Bank of North Dakota their depository. This stabilized the rate of discount all over the state. During the crisis last summer when the Twin City banks raised the rate as high as 8% the Bank of North Dakota stood steadfastly at 6%. This fact makes it easy to guess why the credit trust has decreed its death.

But to finance our undertakings a sale of bonds was necessary. The legislature authorized a bond issue of two million dollars to furnish capital for the bank, five millions for mills and elevators, and five millions for farm loans. The Department of Agriculture is authority for the statement that the farms of the state are mortgaged for \$309,000,000, at an average interest rate of 8 7/10%. If the state bank, in accordance with the Non-partisan plan, had been able to take over these mortgages at 6%, it would have saved the people \$8,343,000 per year. This prospect did not reduce the number of our enemies among the members of the credit trust.

Drive Against the Bond Issue

We anticipated no difficulty in marketing our bonds. And at first we experienced none. In the spring of 1919 the state entered into an agreement with a syndicate of bond-buyers headed by William R. Compton & Co., of Chicago, to purchase \$3,000,000 of 5 per cent. bonds. The bonds were printed and signed and ready to deliver.

Then something went wrong. The contract provided, as is usual, that the sale was subject to the approval of the legal council of the syndicate. Meantime, in spite of the fact that the people of North Dakota had voted seven times in favor of the League program, politicians and business interests started a suit attacking the constitutionality of the whole program, including the bond issue. As a result the attorney for the bond firm advised the Compton Company not to purchase the bonds until the suit attacking their validity had been finally determined. William R. Compton, in a letter written at the time, admitted that the real reason his firm withdrew from the contract was the opposition to the League program on the part of a minority within the state, an opposition which might make it difficult to resell the bonds.

In the first suit, tried before the federal district court in North Dakota, the validity of the bonds was upheld. Another suit,

brought in the Supreme Court of North Dakota, was decided in the same way. The anti-League interests immediately appealed the cases to the Supreme Court of the United States. Under ordinary conditions a decision would not have been handed down in less than two years. Thus our enemies hoped to wear down our resistance even if they did not eventually win the suit.

The legislature was called to meet in special session in November, 1919, and passed a memorial asking the Supreme Court to advance the case on the calendar. This request was heeded, and on May 31, 1920, there was handed down a unanimous decision upholding the constitutionality of the state's program and sustaining the validity of the bonds.

In the meantime the farmers had been asking that the Bank of North Dakota use the powers given to it by law to make farm loans and finance the industries of the state in order that the program should be delayed no longer. The bank, therefore, advanced nearly three million dollars in farm loans at 6% (the average rate before had been 8.7%) and approximately another million to start work on the terminal elevator and the mill at Grand Forks and to make a beginning with the Home Building operations. This took about \$4,000,000 of the funds of the bank. The rest of its resources were deposited with about 800 private banks scattered over the state.

The "Run" on the Bank

At the November, 1920, election the enemies of the League submitted a number of initiative measures, claiming that they were intended to strengthen the industrial program. One of these was a bill providing that county and city treasurers might deposit their funds either with the Bank of North Dakota or with private banks. Through a misunderstanding of its meaning this law was adopted. Its real purpose was to start a "run" on the bank, and in achieving that purpose it was successful. The banks were all short. A light crop and falling prices made it impossible for farmers to pay their loans to local

banks. The majority of county and city treasurers demanded their money in order that they might deposit it in local banks. When the state bank undertook to withdraw the funds which it had redeposited in the local banks it could not collect. The private banks were unable to pay. A number of them closed.

And this is not all. Though Lynn Frazier was triumphantly returned to the governor's chair, we lost the election last fall. Our enemies, miscalled the Independent Voters, won the lower house and placed their officials in various strategic positions. There is bitter irony in the fact that it was the women who defeated the League. The League had been for woman suffrage from the beginning, and had done more to improve the position of women than any party in any state. Yet the women defeated us. It was partly because the women in towns voted in larger numbers than the farmers' wives. Had it not been for woman suffrage we would have won by a majority of 20,000. But we are still for woman suffrage because it is right.

Enemies of the League, some of them traitors to it, immediately began to use their official power to aggravate the difficulties of the bank. Three of them, with thirteen professional accountants, examined its books for a month in the hope of unearthing irregularities. They failed to discover even one. But even before they began their work the inimical press began to spread slander over the land. Though the bank was absolutely sound, the impression was spread that it was insolvent. Banks were failing all through the Northwest, but every failure in North Dakota was loudly heralded as a failure of the Non-partisan program. So the commonwealth and the League suffered in reputation.

The Attitude of the Federal Reserve Bank

But the chief cause of difficulty was Minneapolis Federal Reserve Bank's withdrawal of money from the state. Shortly before the election this Federal Reserve Bank served notice on its member banks to force collection

on farm loans in order to take care of their obligations with it. This action was responsible for the withdrawal of more than two million dollars from our state during the sixty days preceding December 1, 1920. While the Federal Reserve squeezed the farmers throughout the Northwest, North Dakota was singled out as its special object of attack. On this point there can be no doubt.

On December 1, 1920, the loans of the Minneapolis Federal Reserve Bank was as follows for the states of Minnesota, South Dakota, Montana and North Dakota:

	Loans	Population	Per Capita
Minnesota	\$79,670,000	2,387,125	\$33.00
Twin Cities	70,000,000	615,177	112.00
South Dakota.....	11,493,000	636,547	18.00
Montana	7,507,000	548,889	14.00
North Dakota.....	5,165,000	645,680	8.00
Total	\$173,835,000	4,833,418	\$36.00

This table speaks for itself. Surely no one will deny that there was gross discrimination against the rural districts. The Twin Cities, representing business institutions, were accorded \$112.00 credit per capita as against \$8.00 per capita in North Dakota. But the discrimination did not end there. South Dakota, "free from the Bolshevik infection," as Arthur Brisbane put it in a recent editorial, got \$18.00 per capita, or more than twice the amount given to North Dakota. And South Dakota is just as rural in character as North Dakota.

The Future

The legislature adjourned on March 4. Practically no legislation of consequence was accomplished. The constructive measures proposed by the Leaguers were killed by the adverse majority in the house. For a time it looked as though appropriations for state offices and even for state institutions would be almost entirely cut off. But during the closing hours of the session enough "I. V. A.'s," as the anti-Leaguers are called, bolted their factions to avoid this disgrace.

The threat of recall of League officials by anti-Leaguers seems to have been given up.

The farcical investigation into the operations of state-owned ventures has discredited them. They know they would be defeated. At any rate they seem to have suddenly become converted to the idea of leaving matters as they are.

North Dakota is going ahead with its program. There is not the slightest doubt about that point. Of course, neither the officers of

the League nor the rank and file delude themselves into thinking that the fight is over. Many obstructions will still be met with. Misrepresentations of newspapers and politicians will continue. But the worst should now be over. With three staunch Leaguers—Frazier, Lemke and Hagan—on the Industrial Commission, the program will soon become so firmly established as to make the continued fight of the opposition utterly hopeless.

Labor and the North Dakota Drive

Nonpartisan Leaguer

THE drive against North Dakota is a part of the open-shop drive. It is directed against the working-class of America. North Dakota has less government ownership than has New York. The soviet of bankers hate us because we are running a union state. If they destroy us they will put an end to a closed-shop commonwealth, the only one in this country.

The entire bonded indebtedness of our state is \$343,000. Our real estate is worth, at a conservative estimate, three billion dollars. It is assessed at one billion six hundred millions. We are offering on the market \$6,000,000 worth of bonds. A debt of \$6,343,000 would be less than one per cent of our assessed valuation. The bonds are guaranteed by the faith and credit of a great and united people with unlimited power to tax for both interest and principal the wealth of 70,000 square miles of the most productive land in America.

Like quantities of bonds issued by various cities and by other states, bonds less securely backed by assets and less free from burdens of taxation, have recently been disposed of within a few hours. But our representative spent three weeks literally going from door to door in Wall Street. Everywhere he was turned away with the same pleasant ambiguities. When he pressed for a reason, he was told, "Well, we don't like your socialism."

We know now that the banks and bond

houses have combined against us, have decreed that North Dakota must be financially starved into submission, that her bonds shall not be sold unless she consents to go back to slavery. We know that this decree went forth from Minneapolis to Wall Street and that from Wall Street it radiated to the subsidiary centers. The big bankers care nothing for the state or for the sufferings of its hard-working people. They are bound to restore their lost province, their old game preserve. If they can crush our state government, they will hold it up for all time as a nightmare of horror and failure.

There is no crisis within the state. Our enemies have talked of recalling our officials. They dare not resort to the recall. They know they would be beaten. The only danger is the result of a financial plot by enemies outside the state. In the face of this danger we call upon the working-class of the nation for its support. And we have a right to send out this call.

Our enemies feign displeasure at our state ownership. But that cry is only a decoy. What they really fear and hate is a government that works with organized labor rather than against it. Our legislature of organized farmers received organized labor with open arms. It passed the best anti-injunction law in America, the best mine-inspection law, the best compensation law, the full-crew law and the shelter law for rail-

road men, the minimum wage and the eight-hour law for women. And these laws are not dead letters as they were in Colorado; they are strictly administered.

Frazier and the Miners

The results have been all that we hoped for. When the coal strike came last winter Governor Frazier sent for the district manager of the United Mine Workers. Their minds met instantly. The governor declared martial law, seized the mines, satisfied the miners, supplied the people with coal and paid the owners a royalty. The whole matter was simplicity itself. Coal was mined every day while the governors of other states were holding meetings to "canvass the situa-

tion;" yes, while the governor of Kansas, supposed to be presidential timber, was mining coal with school-boys at \$125.00 a ton, while the school-boys were protected (?) by soldiers and the miners were cowed into submission. Governor Frazier, for the first time in American history, sent soldiers to protect the workers instead of to over-awe and intimidate them.

Do you suppose that big business will spare North Dakota in the open-shop drive? Big business knows that if this state government lives its influence will spread to other states, that labor will be emancipated and the people will be free. Therefore we cannot sell our bonds. This fight is labor's fight. We call upon labor to buy these bonds and save the state and its program from ruin.

Against the Third International

B. C. Vladeck

THE gist of the philosophy of the Third or Communist International may be expressed in a sentence:

The world is in the throes of a social revolution, and if it is not—we will make it so.

That the world is in the throes of a social revolution is very explicitly stated in the first paragraph of the declaration of the second congress of the new International on the rôle of the Communist Party in the proletarian revolution. According to this document,

"we are living in an epoch of civil war. The critical hour has struck. In almost all countries where there is a labor movement of any importance the working class, arms in hand, stands in the midst of fierce and decisive battles."

That the revolution is to be manufactured where it has not already broken out may be clearly inferred from the nature of the apparatus the Communist International is endeavoring to set up,—an apparatus which is nicely set for the precipitation of a revolution independent of actual conditions.

That the world is in the throes of a social revolution is difficult to dispute. Surely the world was never before in such a state of instability. But revolution may move backward as well as forward. The fierce play of gigantic forces, which we call revolution, not only creates but also destroys worlds; and it is quite certain, sad as it may be, that many of the revolutions which have shaken the world to its foundations have resulted not only in birth but also in miscarriage.

The Hungarian revolution is dead without the slightest prospect of immediate resurrection.

The German revolution is in its death agony, the split of the Independent Socialist Party having inflicted a new wound in its body.

An Austrian revolution seems impossible in view of the present plight of the country.

The chances of an Italian revolution have diminished after the failure of the factory seizures to develop into broader national action.

France is decayed and played out.

England, no doubt, is on the threshold of substantial revolutionary changes, but the Labor Party which will be the carrier of the English revolution, will not go the whole length of the revolutionary course. At best it will revolutionize England, leaving the huge colonial territories in their present state of oppression.

It is ridiculous to speak of a state of revolution in the United States. The capitalist class has nowhere been so firmly entrenched, so impudent in the realization and manifestation of its power as in the United States to-day.

The only revolution which is a social revolution in the full sense of the word is the Russian Revolution. The only country where the proletariat "stands, arms in hand, in the midst of fierce and decisive battles" is Russia.

The Uncompleted Task

Russia, however, has as yet carried out but a part of her revolutionary program.

In the realm of basic production in Russia "the peasantry have remained the property owners, and this has created new capitalist relations. . . . As long as there are peasants and workmen, Socialism cannot be realized. It was comparatively easy to combat and defeat the Russian White Guards, the landowners and the capitalists with their supporters, the Mensheviks, but this victory [over the peasantry] will be hard to win, for economic tendencies cannot be vanquished in the same manner as military tendencies. There lies before us a long road that must be captured step by step . . . these masses [the peasantry] which are counted in millions can grasp the revolution only as a result of their own experience in their daily life. . . ."

Thus Lenin appraised the situation in an address before a congress of trade unions. The peasantry, this vast class of *petit bourgeois*, constitute the most formidable internal enemy of Russia and can be conquered not by force of arms but only through education, organization and modern agricultural technique. And this requires much work and much time. Moreover, the industrial workers who at present exercise their dictator-

ship over Russia must become economically more secure before they can cope successfully with the problem of converting the peasantry to socialism. Unless Russia secures an adequate supply of machinery, tools, and certain essential raw stuffs, it will be impossible to go on with the industrial reconstruction of the country. The cities will dwindle in size and influence, the power of the industrial proletariat will dwindle with the cities, and instead of emerging from the revolution as an inspiring model and guide for the world workers, Russia will emerge as a *petit-bourgeois* democracy resting on the foundation of rural proprietorship. And if the rest of the world will not emulate Russia in the near future, the Russian workers will be compelled to obtain their tools and machinery from a *capitalist world*, and this means commercial treaties, concessions, *realpolitik*.

The world revolution will not suffer thereby. Many of our comrades are greatly, though naturally, mistaken in thinking that the mere fact of a workers' dictatorship in Russia constitutes a powerful propaganda for revolution in other countries. As long as the Russian workers are starving and are struggling desperately for their very existence, they are a source of inspiration only to the enlightened workers. Only when the Russian workers are in a position to show that their dictatorship has resulted in better working conditions and greater comforts than those of their class-fellows in the capitalist countries, will the Russian revolution become a mighty and effective propagandist for revolution elsewhere. *To be a sincere friend of Russia we must not only go off into ecstatic fits over the noble heroism of the Russian masses, but also aid these masses in upbuilding a firm material culture on socialist bases. It is for this reason that the Soviet Congress and the more moderate Soviet leaders are so eager to grant all possible concessions to the capitalistic world in exchange for an opportunity to begin at once and on a large scale the work of peaceful reconstruction.*

Third International a Danger to Russia

Thus, from the standpoint of the Russian Revolution, the essential need of the present is not more wars but more peace, and if peace cannot come as a result of a world revolution it will come, if only for a while, as a result of a compromise with the capitalist world. But such a compromise will never be effected if the Third International will persist in its refusal to view the actual conditions and will attempt to *force* a world revolution despite the unfavorable circumstances.

And from the tenets of the Communist International it is clear that if revolutions do not come spontaneously they can be brought about, they can be made, just as mechanically as building a railroad or making a new garment.

"The first heroic uprising of the French proletariat during the Paris Commune of 1871 would have been much more successful and many errors and shortcomings would have been avoided had there been a strong communist party, no matter how small."

The Paris Commune, then, according to this view, failed not because of the absence of a strong, organized, class-conscious working class, but because of the absence of a strong Communist Party. Not the masses of workers are essential to the success of a revolutionary uprising of the workers, but the communist party, "no matter how small."

Utopianism Reform

It is a tedious task to quibble as to whether this or that theory is or is not in accord with the Marxian doctrine, but the view of the labor movement and revolution advanced by the Communist International has not been met with since the day of the Blanquists, the Anarchists, and perhaps the Russian Socialist Revolutionists.

The modern socialist movement is based on mass-consciousness and mass-action. The *Communist Manifesto* ends with the proud call: "Workers of the world unite!" And from the time of Marx and Engels to the

time of Plekhanov and Lenin the socialist movement combatted the idea of Utopians of all shades, that socialism can be brought about by a *coup*, through the heroism and determination of isolated revolutionary groups. The Communist International is, in this respect, a reversion to the utopian socialism. The reversion is so obvious and unmistakable, that Charles Rappoport, one of the most prominent leaders of the French Communists, concludes his appeal in the first issue of *La Revue Communiste* with the words: "Communists of the world unite!"

Communists, not workers.

With such an evaluation of the labor movement it is quite natural for the "dictatorship of the proletariat" to turn into a "dictatorship of communists," and it is upon such a dictatorship that the entire organization of the Communist International rests.

The collapse of the socialist movement during the war, the communists feel, was not the result of the weakness of socialist organization or spiritual deficiency of the masses. It was a result of treason on the part of the leaders. All that is necessary to do in order to abolish the evils is to pillory the renegades Kautsky and Longuet, Hillquit and Henderson, Ledebour and Fritz Adler. The strongly organized minority, "no matter how small," plays a more important part than the consciousness of the masses. *First* the social revolution must be made—the education of the workers will be accomplished *afterward*. All the Communist International needs is a kind of international organization of stock units, a kind of *Bojevaya organizatsia* of the old-time socialist-revolutionists. . . .

Dictatorship Before and After Revolution

The revolution, then, will come as a result of a *coup* by the "advance guard," by the Communist Party, "no matter how small" and such being the case, our task is definite, our duty is clear: we must organize the advance guard.

A mass movement can tolerate differences of opinion. Not so with the Communist In-

ternational. This international advance guard must be cast of one piece. All the sections of the International must bear the same name, must have the same program, to the minutest details.

A mass movement must be carried on in the open—the communist parties of all lands must work *sub rosa*, making use of legal avenues only as part of the general plan.

A mass movement must be democratic and autonomous—the communist party must be centralized, unified and dictatorial. A Communist, whether he be active in a labor union, a coöperative organization or educational institution must take orders from his party.

Since under this form of organization individuals play an important part, the party must, from time to time, comb the membership with a view of eliminating those who have independent opinions on this or that question. The structure of the Communist parties of all countries must resemble that of a government in time of revolution.

The Twenty-one Points

It is generally supposed that the 21 points which the Communist International has formulated as entrance requirements for Socialist Parties desirous of joining it constitute all the stipulations in the entrance agreement. In reality there are not 21 but 161 points—all the theses and statutes of the Third International as adopted at its second Congress. Together they constitute a code of dogmas and a code of behavior not only for the parties, but for their individual members as well. The basic tenets are stated side by side with practical advice, declarations of principle—together with petty orders. Instructions are given to guide not only the actions of a Communist but his mode of thinking as well. The 21st point of the famous 21 states explicitly that "those members of the party who reject the conditions and theses of the Third International are liable to be excluded from the party."

Every detail is foreseen. The conditions of the workers' struggle in every country are determined, specified and labeled. Specific

instructions are given for every occasion. Ready explanations are offered for every possible failure. Thus the Hungarian revolution failed for the sole reason that Bela Kun did not take the precaution of preventing a coalition with the centrists. . . .

Whence so peculiar, so naive a conception of the workers' struggle the world over? How is it that leaders possessing considerable experience and a considerable knowledge of history go back to the long discarded "schemes" of revolutions?

The Russian Revolution—that is the answer.

Forces Back of Revolutions

The Russian Bolsheviks, a large number of them at any rate, have been fostering the fond thought that the Russian Revolution is exclusively a result of their philosophy, their organization and their efforts. Such a view is humanly natural. The Bolsheviks had a definite program, a solid party and high courage, while other parties had none of these. It would be futile as well as unjust not to acknowledge the tremendous influence and achievement of the Bolsheviks, both of the party and of the individual leaders. Whatever may happen in Russia, the names of Lenin, Trotzky, Kalinin and others will endure forever, will be written in fiery characters in the annals of revolutionary Russia. Their self-sacrifice, their noble, heroic stubbornness, their capacity for organization have no parallel in the history of any political party of any epoch. The tsaristic regime was uprooted and destroyed more thoroughly than any other political order in the history of mankind.

But also the circumstances which made such an uprooting possible have no parallel. Centuries of tyranny and despotism; an unhappy, disappointed peasantry, a solid, politically alert revolutionary working class; years of war and devastation; a land without a middle class, save the enervated and helpless *intelligentsia*; and finally a war-time revolution led by a party or parties with no program, with no plan.

The Hungarian and German revolutions failed not because of the indecision or treachery of the leaders. Many circumstances combined to bring about their failure; chief among them is the fact that in Hungary and particularly in Germany there was an active, alert and well-organized middle class. It is more difficult to perform a surgical operation upon a man than upon a rabbit, for man's anatomy is the more complicated. And it is more difficult to make a revolution in Germany with her highly organized economic life than it was in Russia, which is still in a primitive economic stage.

But even Russia cannot conform to the spirit of the Communist International and must resort to politics as well as "arms in the hands of the proletariat." From the Brest-Litovsk peace to the Polish peace Russia was compelled to go in for compromises in order to maintain the gains of the revolution. The existence of an individual or a nation is but a chain of compromises with hard reality. And the Russian revolution, being a live thing, behaves in accord with the law of life. The Communist International, however, is not a live being, and for this reason it can afford to be rigid and inflexible.

Accomplishment of Third International

The only thing the Communist International has accomplished so far is the disruption of the socialist movement. In this direction its success has been colossal. It failed to depose or defeat Lloyd George or Palmer, Millerand or Giolitti, but it did succeed in defeating or deposing Kautsky and Ledebour, Fritz Adler and Otto Bauer, Longuet and Hillquit, Henderson and McDonald. . . . The Socialist Parties of France, Italy, America and England have been split and weakened, and the capitalist reaction in these countries rages unchecked. The ardent communists who did not vote for Debs may be proud of their achievement, and the more the Socialist Party is weakened the greater the achievement and the glory of the Third International.

This, of course, is but the beginning. After

the Socialist Party is disposed of the unions will come next; especially the radical unions in the United States. These, too, are being "betrayed" by their leaders of a bourgeois turn of mind, and in the name of the social revolution they ought to be disrupted. If this is not the view of the heads of the Third International, it is the view of their zealous followers, of the ardent and fanatical disciples.

Thus the socialist movement is torn to fragments in the midst of a great epoch. The socialist movement is by its very nature international. But the Third International is incapable of sustaining the international scope of the socialist movement. The problems of the labor movement in various countries and the diverse historical circumstances cannot be fitted to the Procrustean bed of the 21 points.

Perhaps the socialist movement is itself partly to blame for this state of affairs. We *have* overrated the value of parliamentarism and we *have* neglected the education of the masses through timely revolutionary manifestations. But the punishment is too great, far greater than the crime.

Book Notes

Guild Socialism. By G. D. H. Cole. N. Y.: Frederic Stokes. 1921. 201 pp.

The latest book on guild socialism written by its most brilliant expounder. The reader will note that Mr. Cole has changed his position in many particulars since the publication of "Self Government in Industry." The book is indispensable to all who wish to know the most recent developments in this important phase of socialist thought.

A History of British Socialism. By M. Beer. Vol. II. N. Y.: Harcourt, Brace and Co. 1921. 413 pp.

A scholarly and comprehensive account of the history of socialism in Great Britain from the days of the Chartists to 1920. A companion book to the Vol. I which dealt with the origins of the movement. The book was reviewed in *The Socialist Review* of October, 1920, by Arthur Gleason.

The Workers' International. By R. W. Postgate. N. Y.: Harcourt, Brace and Co. 1920. 123 pp.

A careful history of the first and second internationals of the workers, and a short account of the beginnings of the third international.

The Crisis in Russia. By Arthur Ransome. N. Y.: B. W. Huebsch. 201 pp.

An objective, unprejudiced account of the Russian government and Russian industry as they are at present. Americans will be especially interested in the account of a plan for industrial reconstruction designed to make Russia practically independent of the rest of the world.

For the Third International

J. B. Salutsky

COMRADE VLADECK indicts the Third International on three counts, one general and two specific. The general charge is directed against the theory of the new organization, the other two condemn its action.

According to this indictment the Third International is: (1) dangerous to the Russian revolution itself; (2) detrimental to the labor and socialist movement the world over; (3) anti-Marxian in theory.

Each and every one of these three charges, if sustained by the court of socialist public opinion, would suffice to deport the defendant from our friendly shores for good and all. Cumulatively the charges invoke no less than a death sentence. Despite it all the Third International is still much alive.

The Danger to Russia

The Third International is a menace to Russia—so runs the first article of impeachment. That would seem to be enough. Are we not all heart and soul with the Workers' Republic, Soviet Russia? Our hearts go out to the struggling sons and daughters of that great motherland of social freedom, to those who "stand, arms in hand, in the midst of fierce and decisive battles." And yet that *enfant terrible* of all times, the Third International, is threatening the very life of Russia! One recalls that sturdy Welshman, David Lloyd George, in the House of Commons and his surprised, innocent query: "Who is Russia?" Who is Russia, Comrade Vladeck? Of course, the 130 millions of the population, the peasants, the proletarians, the soldiers and the counter-revolutionists and the passive lot designated for all decorative and oratorical purposes as "the people." Yet when Lloyd George put his inquisitive, "Who is Russia?" he aimed at "the people and the rest of them," but he really

wanted to know who was the recognized government of Russia. For "by their government ye shall know them."

Who, then, is Russia? If not Bakhmetiev and our friend "Information Bureau" Sack, then it must look much like Lenin and Trotzky. Yet the latter gentlemen are the signers of the Theses and Principles of the Third International. So we discover, by courtesy of a socialist living in New York, that the man Lenin, the man Trotzky and others of the Third International are dealing mortal blows, through the Third International, to Soviet Russia—that is, to the same man Lenin and the same man Trotzky and the same others. These fellows must be guilty of no less a crime than suicide. It is just too horrible! Luckily these funny Russians are warned in time, and there is every reason to hope that our newly discovered anti-soviet leaders will be stopped.

The Danger to the World Movement

But the Third International will have to square itself on another point. It is working inestimable harm to the socialist and labor movement the world over. In this direction

"its success has been colossal. It failed to depose or defeat Lloyd George or Palmer, Miller and or Giolitti, but it did succeed in defeating or deposing Kautsky and Ledebour, Fritz Adler and Otto Bauer, Longuet and Hillquit, Henderson and MacDonald. . . . The socialist parties of France, Italy, America and England have been split and weakened. . . . The ardent communists who did not vote for Debs may be proud of their achievement, and the more the socialist party is weakened the greater the achievement and the glory of the Third International."

And more frightful things are to come:

"This is the beginning. After the socialist party is disposed of the unions will come next, especially the radical unions in the United States."

But why, O dear Cassandra, seest thou so

black? Why is sealed the doom of the radical American unions, theirs above all others? If radical, might not they choose to form the trades union council of the Third International and thus avoid their imminent fate? We all cherish the labor unions, where, as you know, we have been "boring from within" so untiringly and with such great success for so many years. And especially the radical unions of the United States. Have not these radical unions been, of late, so radical that nearly all of them have radically rejected their radicalism? And these terrific, brutal Muscovites would spare none of them, would send them all to utter destruction.

Vladeck knows how tenderly we all feel on this point, and he plays up the inevitable undoing of our unions by that cruel man Lenin. Yet the effort is vain. There is little danger in sight.

The Third International proposes no such dastardly deed as "destroying our unions," any more than socialists like Vladeck propose to "destroy the family." It is true that the Trade Union Council of the Third International fights the Amsterdam Trade Union International, charging it with being, unconsciously perhaps, a tool of the bourgeoisie. Article 10 of the frightful 21 conditions of affiliation is rather specific in the matter of relations with the Amsterdam International: "It is the duty of parties belonging to the Communist International vigorously and persistently to fight the yellow trade union international organized at Amsterdam."

Just the other day Mr. Gompers and the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. withdrew their organization from the Amsterdam International because that International is the most revolutionary thing in creation. Will the A. F. of L. be charged with destroying the unions? Of course not. Why, then, be so scrupulous toward the Third International and Lenin and give the A. F. of L. and Gompers such sympathetic understanding?

It may be claimed that the Third International and its affiliated parties intend to spare none of the existing local unions. But, again, point 9 of the 21 points deals specifi-

cally with the familiar problem of party and unions and states the position with unmistakable clearness. It provides that communists must join the established trade unions, coöperatives and other mass organizations and form *nuclei* within them.

Is there anything wrong with this prescription? It is the same old "boring from within" policy with teeth in it. In fact, you may substitute "socialists" for "communists" and you have something much like the Indianapolis resolution of the Socialist Party on trade unions. Is there anything wrong with attempting to win over the trade unions for communism (or socialism)?

The "teeth" in this resolution—paragraph 9—are evident in the demand that the groups of party members are obliged to abide by party directions. Is party discipline objected to? We are not—or ought not to be—free lances in socialist exploits. Besides, the party is ourselves. May we not be responsible to ourselves collectively?

As to the intention of destroying the socialist movement, that movement, in an international sense, had been destroyed prior to the initiation of the Third International. The Second International died on the night of August 4th, 1914, after a long and protracted illness, its blood having been weakened by an overwhelming predominance of leucocytes (white corpuscles) over the erythrocytes (red corpuscles). What now parades as the Second International is not the genuine article but a lamentable debris of a once glorious structure. And as to the Fourth, the Two-and-a-Half, the Between-the-Acts, or whatever you may call the abortive Viennese product—well, the less we say of it the better.

Value of Third International

On the other hand, the Third International, more than any other single factor except the Soviet Revolution, has been responsible for the regeneration of socialist faith since the outbreak of the war and the breakdown of pre- and anti-war socialism. Had it not been for it and its predecessors, the confer-

ences at Zimmerwald and Kienthal, socialist international unity would have been sick beyond recovery. And as to the movement within each country, it is sheer nonsense to speak of the new international as the divider of the socialist movement. You might as well give the calendar credit for the arrival of spring or blame the weather-man for the snow in the streets of New York. The sole guilt of the Third International is the most definite formulation of the problem and the task ahead. And in response to it the elements in the movement that are yet capable of reading the signs of the time are throwing off all spiritual shackles, breaking through their habitual sheepishness and marching forward.

The vital elements in the movement had long sought liberation from apathetic and anaemic leadership. The Third International has responded to their need. Does this mean breaking up the movement in every country? No, quite the contrary. Mushy, confusionist unity is no asset in the fierce struggles which the development of society has placed before us. Unity is a meaningless word and not a worthy object at all unless it aims at the creation of a party of consolidated thought and decisive action. But this is what the Third International creates. Call it "detrimental to the movement" if you please.

The Third International and Marx.

The fiercest onslaught on the position of the Third International Vladeck makes when he charges it with faithlessness toward Marx. He accuses it of being utopian. In his view it holds to "the ideas of utopians of all shades that socialism can be brought about by a *coup*, through the heroism and determination of isolated revolutionary groups."

Indeed one would feel like banking on "heroism and determination" in view of the total fruitlessness of our efforts here, where "safe and sane" socialism is rigidly adhered to. And where did Vladeck discern the love of the Third International for "*isolated groups*?" Has he failed to learn that con-

centration, centralization—and not looseness—are the very element, the fundamental essence, of the Third International? The Communists, so he would have us believe, persist in refusal to view actual conditions and attempt to *force* a world revolution despite the unfavorable conditions.

This *is* criminal if it is true. But is it true that the Third International is attempting to force a world revolution? And are conditions unfavorable? Vladeck briefly and briskly reviews the world situation and arrives at a rather dreary conclusion. In Hungary, Austria, Italy and France we have failure, feebleness, decay, no prospect of immediate resurrection. England, no doubt, is on the threshold of substantial revolution, but the Labor Party would stem it. And as to the United States, why, the capitalist class has been nowhere else so firmly entrenched, so impudent in the realization of its power.

Even Russia has failed to accomplish the task before it. For the realization of its aims it needs peace with capitalist Europe and America, and here the Third International stands in the way, attempting to force a world revolution.

The contradictoriness of this would-be analysis is appalling. In one breath it is said that talk of revolution is ridiculous because the United States is strong (that is, its capitalist class is powerful); and there is no hope for revolution in France just because France (that is, its bourgeoisie) is decayed and played out. We learn that chances of revolution in Italy are diminished after its failure last year—evidently meaning that chances of a revolution would be good after a successful revolution. The Austrian revolution seems to be dead and the German revolution is dead, presumably because the iron heel of Allied imperialism is pressing too hard. But then Hungary comes in for its share of hopelessness in spite of its being one of the "most favored nations" of Allied imperialism. England is the only somewhat hopeful spot on this dark map of Europe, but there the Labor Party will stem the rev-

olution. Yet it is the Labor Party that holds most definitely Mr. Vladeck's affections. And to crown his whole mental structure he concludes, "that the whole world is in the throes of a social revolution is difficult to dispute."

Forcing a World Revolution.

Two other points must be taken up, (1) the idea of forcing a world revolution and (2) the dictatorship of the communists vs. the dictatorship of the proletariat. How does the Third International *force* a world revolution despite unfavorable conditions? Opponents cannot point to a single case of such use of force by the Third International. It can do nothing of the kind. Rather may one say that entente imperialism is actually forcing a world revolution by its cruel practice of international looting while enforcing abject slavery among nine-tenths of the organized nations.

The Third International does not have to force a world revolution. Such a revolution is on, as Vladeck himself admits. Yet the Third International as an organization and in its propaganda is opposed to any attempt to force a world revolution. It holds, on the contrary, that any such attempt, prematurely made, is doomed to failure. The object of the Third International is to accelerate the revolution all over the world, but by no means to provoke it artificially. This is repeatedly stated explicitly and specifically in those famous, or infamous, 21 or 161 points. The Third International proceeds on the premise that whether the working-class is prepared, unprepared, or insufficiently prepared, a general state of crisis is present in most countries. And, if anything, it attempts to force some sleepy socialist minds out of their lethargy. For drilling in revolutionary thought and action is the first prerequisite of any successful revolution. Neglect of this kind of preparation is most criminal. The Third International has no patience with those who shirk this duty.

Revolutions are not made to order. They happen, if you please. But no one is obliged to be caught napping when they happen.

You may not know when the volcano will erupt, but it is an unpardonable sin not to be aware when a social volcano is on the verge of eruption.

The Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is the central point in the theory of the revolution promulgated by the Third International. The social revolution is in the interests of the proletariat or it merits attention in this discussion. The proud call, "Workers of the world, unite," is the backbone of all socialist revolutionary activity. If Marx and Engels had done nothing but send forth this glorious call into the struggling life of labor, their names would deserve a place of honor in the pantheon of the proletarian revolution. Yet what does the Third International do? It violates fundamental Marxism. To bear witness thereto the French communist leader, Charles Rappoport, is imported. Indeed, Rappoport concludes his appeal in the first issue *La Revue Communiste* with the words, "Communists of the world, unite."

"Communists," not "workers," Mr. Vladeck scornfully remarks. We wish to reassure our friend's troubled conscience; as yet the Third International has not changed the slogan. "Workers of the world," not "communists of the world," is still the pass-word. Yet, while it may not be good manners to call a spade a spade, why not admit, tacitly at least, that it is a spade?

Of course, by all means, the dictatorship of the proletariat; but would it not depend on those who effect the dictatorship to make it, in reality, the dictatorship of the victorious party of the proletariat? The victorious Communist Party of Russia virtually makes the dictatorship of the proletariat a dictatorship of the Communist Party. What is wrong with this? Would the Socialist Party of the United States act differently?

May the proposition be illustrated by the quite notorious case of one George R. Lunn vs. the Socialist Party of Schenectady, N. Y.? That gentleman happened to be elected mayor on the socialist ticket. On some mat-

ter of appointments he proposed to act in opposition to the local socialist organization but in harmony with the wishes of "the people," another name for the workers. He wished to be dictated to by the proletariat, but the Socialist Party insisted on the dictatorship by the Party. On another point the Mayor was willing to be dictated to by the enrolled socialist voters. The Party was not willing to concede even that much, and carried its point all the way to expulsion of Mayor Lunn from the Party. For my part I am satisfied that the Party acted rightly. Will Mr. Vladeck side with "democratic" Socialist Mayor Lunn? Mark you, the Socialist Party is opposed to the dictatorship, yet amidst our most blooming democracy in the pre-war, pre-Third International days, it acted on the theory of the dictatorship of the communists.

And it cannot be otherwise. Classes operate politically through parties. Class interests are represented by parties. The working-class, while a distinct physical and sociological unit, is politically inarticulate unless organized into a party. It effects its political will through no other channel, and as the dictatorship of the proletariat presupposes the political willing of the class, the dictatorship of the class is realized in the dictatorship of the party. Speak, if you will, of a labor government, of a workers' government, of a workers' and peasants' government, but in reality unless you substitute a political party for the class you are uttering mere words without any concrete meaning. Just fancy good old New York under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Peter Brady, Hugh Frayne, Peter Brindell *et tutti quanti* will most logically be entitled to a say in the management of the dictatorship, for they are proletarians, or will be by that time. And with these gentlemen will be eligible all the good workers coming under the heading of socialists, communists, anarchists, single-taxers, independents, free-thinkers, Catholics, cranks, freaks and all the rest of the lot that it takes to "make up a world." Wouldn't it be a most glorious conglomerate for run-

ning a dictatorship of the proletariat? Yet they are all proletarians. Will Mr. Vladeck undertake to voice their variegated wills and turn them into uniform deeds? And all this will be happening under duress of civil war, external war, in the midst of mortal dangers for the proletarian dictatorship.

Of course Mr. Vladeck would not assume leadership under such circumstances unless a distinct party with a specific program is invested with power to carry out its program. But this is just what the dictatorship of the proletariat amounts to in Russia. And it is from a sense for the definite and the real that the Third International drops the evasive, loose, meaningless terminology that had engendered itself in our propaganda of the days prior to the present time of action. Precision is the command of the hour, and it is not lacking in the vocabulary of the Third International.

And this is why, among other reasons, the Third International holds indisputably the title to leadership of the proletariat of the world. Because it introduces into the revolutionary socialist movement the elements of discipline, of concerted action, of realistic and fundamentally Marxian propaganda, it gains daily in power and recognition. One party after another falls in line with it, and holding themselves aloof are only insignificant groups of leaders without a following, or scattered mass-groups that have discarded old leadership without having acquired new leaders and fallen into the new way. But even these will come.

EDWIN MARKHAM

Writes to the Editor of **THE SOCIAL PREPARATION**, the Religious-Socialist Quarterly:

"I am glad to know that you have the heart to hold aloft the flag of the future."
\$1.00 a year. Address **GENEVA, N. Y.**

CUTTING *the* COST of PRINTING

is an easy matter with the very newest labor-saving machinery with which our up-to-date plant is equipped. Let us estimate on your next job and be convinced.

The NEWS PRESS, Inc.
LAKE GENEVA WISCONSIN

The New Turn of the I. W. W.

Art Shields

ANYONE reading the Chicago publications of the I. W. W. will see that a profound change is taking place in the organization. The builder is displacing the agitator, and in general, attention is turning from the drama of persons toward the administration of things.

The change in policy is symbolized by the change in name of the chief publication, the *Industrial Pioneer* succeeding the *One Big Union Monthly*. The *Industrial Pioneer* is concerned less with the worker than with his job and less with the job than with the industry as a whole. In the last two issues of the magazine there have been articles dealing with the industrial facts of lumber, tobacco, glass, fruit growing, petroleum, shipping, and the place of the engineer in industry.

"What has all this to do with the class struggle?" asks the old fashioned revolutionist.

"It has everything to do with the administration and reorganization of industry," says the new I. W. W. "We are organizing industrially to build the structure of the new society; so let us know the industries."

In the other prominent I. W. W. paper, *Solidarity*, little space has been given of late to the sins of the employer or the fakirishness of the labor politician and other by-products of the present industrial order. Emotional appeals are at a minimum and defense news is skeletonized. Cant phrases and revolutionary jargon are falling into the discard. Correspondents are asking for more organic science and less abstract economics, and reminding the readers that a factory cannot be run with Karl Marx.

The rank and file like this, though the "thrill-monger" does not. The hundred per cent rebel who has to have war paint and war whoops fails to find his psychological toxins in this matter and asks what is happening to the I. W. W. Is it turning yellow?

The question has little interest to the average industrial worker, who is inclined to be a little color blind on such matters. The red flag gives him little enthusiasm. It does not spell industry, which is the means of life in a highly developed country. He knows what he wants, however. He wants scientific production and distribution. Therefore he is primarily concerned with the industrial mechanism that will bring this. He wants the industrial facts, and the Chicago papers are catering to his demand.

He has felt the surge and backwash of agitation for fifteen years, and now he is reacting into an intense realism. His attitude is pungently expressed in the following jingle culled from a recent issue of *Solidarity*:

"The wind jammer jams and he jams all day
While workers upbuild in a skilful way;
The windy one rides through a metaphor cloud
While builders stride through the working crowd.
A union built on a useful plank
Is built on the job by the skilful rank,
Never on clouds or a moving sand bar
But out on the works where the *blue prints* are."

"When did this change come over the I. W. W.?" asks the amazed outsider. "I thought the motto on the song book, 'To Fan the Flames of Discontent' expressed the organization's policy."

Original Constructive Purpose

The answer is that the constructive program has been latent from the beginning, though it is now attaining determined development for the first time. The organization began with a preamble declaring the purpose of organizing for production, and all through the fifteen years of its existence a portion of the membership has tried to get the organization as a whole to take up the problems of production. "Forget Marx and study the industries," said Ben Williams in 1907, rebuking the "economists"; and George Speed, oldest and best of "wobblies," has ever re-

minded his audiences of the essential constructive purpose of the I. W. W. to organize production, so that chaos and starvation might not follow the inevitable capitalist break-down.

That the actual tactics of the organization became agitational rather than industrial in the early years of its existence was a natural result of the conditions under which it grew. Its membership came largely from the hideous production-centers of lumber, copper, and textiles. The expression of the organization was thus the protest of these workers against their exploitation or against the unions which they felt had betrayed them. The union felt in terms of the worker and his wage and the boss and his profits rather than of the worker and the machine and the factory and its product.

On the Job

But as the organization became rooted in certain industries, it began to take a deeper color from its environment. Shop or camp locals were striven for. The agricultural workers developed the job delegate, who recruited members and held meetings on the job in the roomy, outdoor work-places of the West. Before 1917 lumber workers in some camps were already electing their foremen. The idea spread that the industry was not merely for the purpose of filling up the union hall but that the union must be built into the industry.

Genuine industrialism was about to unfold its wings as a natural development when the war persecution suddenly burst forth and knocked the organization topsy turvy. The extrication of thousands of active members from legal toils became the program. Defense submerged organization. It was impossible, quoting an old time I. W. W. of the East, to "scuffle with legal thugs up the blind alley of defense and to build an industrial organization at the same time."

But the reaction which came after the armistice was sharp, in spite of the continuance of persecution. Through the rank and file of the I. W. W. is a sullen, half sup-

pressed resentment against any defense program that interferes with organization work. The new society is not built through propaganda in the courts but "out on the works where the blue prints are." The reaction to industrialism was the sharper because of the apparently impending crash of the business system in the world-at-large. Building the new society became an immediate and imperative program. What are we doing about it? asked the fellow workers of each other.

The New Industrialism

Industrialism itself began to take on new meaning, as something more than mere industrial unionism. The "army of production" of the preamble was seen to be something more than a mass organization of persons within industries, controlling production by vote. It was visualized as something marshalled along the structural lines of industry and functioning according to the requirements of industry.

Several forces served to convince the unskilled workers that they could not work out their industrial salvation without the aid of men of real industrial knowledge.

Lenin's *Soviets at Work*, distributed in thousands by Seattle unionists and, more important, the experience of the membership itself, developed this line of thought. The failure of strikes off and on the job, it was pointed out, was often due to ignorance of strategic facts.

Conventions began to talk in this vein. The 1919 General Convention of the I. W. W. discussed plans for industrial literature and industrial surveys. In early 1920 the Spokane District Convention of the Lumber Workers' Industrial Union, representing many thousand loggers, declared that all literature published before 1920 should be scrapped in favor of real industrial hand-books. Job delegates told the convention that they were badly handicapped by the literature of agitation and abstract economics, and asked for pamphlets dealing with industry. The Agricultural Workers' Convention took similar action.

The Research Bureau

The General Convention of 1920 set a milestone in labor history by instituting a Bureau of Industrial Research that should lay out a working plan of the industrial system. Plumb Plan Leagues, etc., had specialized on finance. This Bureau was to devote its attention to the physical facts of industry. One "wobbly" at the time thus epitomized the purpose:

"We don't want this Bureau to be side-tracked into money investigations. Industries are not run with money but with raw material, power, machinery and labor. Economists can't tell us about these things, but engineers can, and we can tell ourselves a lot if we pool our knowledge through the Bureau."

The Bureau is undertaking large scale operations that amount to an industrial survey of the United States. Engineers were employed to draw up a blue print outline of the principal industries, charting out the location of plants and the flow of materials. Especial attention was given to wood products, transportation and coal. In spite of unfortunate delays the first sections of the wood survey have already been completed in manuscript and chart form and will establish the basis for valuable work in the large and growing membership of the northwest logging country. The loggers want to know the extent of the nation's lumber resources and her lumber needs and how the product is used. A log is not just a log. It is the raw material for paper, railroad ties or chicken-houses. The study of transportation, a monumental subject, has just been started, but will be pushed to the utmost resources of the Bureau in accordance with the support which special appeals for money will bring.

In the coal fields the need of a survey is most evident now because of a recent increase in membership, but the vital power and chemical factors of coal in relation to all industry make such knowledge imperative in any case.

Footholds gained by the I. W. W. in Eastern centers where industry is vast and intricate as compared with the camps and fields

of the Far West have made the need for organization knowledge of industry more apparent. It is obviously hopeless to organize the steel industry for production—something very different from merely lining up members on a class basis—without understanding that great and complex organism. It naturally followed that the convention of the industrial union having jurisdiction, meeting in Detroit last February, indorsed the program for an industrial survey. The large membership in Detroit itself is alive to the impossibility of organizing the automobile industry for production without an industrial apparatus that will bring them the requisite amounts of rubber tires from Akron.

The next stage of development will, logically, be a reorganization according to the lines of industry, so that a member will not merely represent railroad transportation but engine number so and so, on such and such a railroad. Such an organization could tell what operating strength it had in any industry, any plant or any department, and what strategic places were unrepresented, and could go after the necessary personnel to fill essential vacancies. If a necessary technician were lacking, steps could be taken to get him. That the technician might not want to take out a card in the I. W. W. is unimportant, provided he would co-operate with the other workers in the plant in his industrial capacity.

Going After the Technician

The drive on the technician is an important phase of the work which the I. W. W. will undertake in the coming year. As an indispensable factor in most plant operation and in all co-ordination between the separate industrial units his aid is imperative. The invitations to the engineering societies of New York to send delegates to the second session of the Unemployment Conference of Greater New York is an evidence of this drive. The engineers were asked to come in order to help work out a plan for the reopening of industry. Several engineers attended and are now in touch with the Committee of Action

of the conference. The engineer, obviously, will not function as an agitator, but he will help mightily in industrial action.

Does the I. W. W. really expect to organize the industries by itself? it may be asked.

The question is unimportant. All the I. W. W. feels is that the industries must be organized and organized in the right way, whether inside or outside of the I. W. W., or the people of America will perish by the millions in the coming crisis. This is not a primitive agricultural country like Russia. It is a highly developed, industrially interdependent mechanism. All America is, broadly speaking, one industry. A breakdown that prevents essential parts from functioning will cut off the cities from food and the factories from raw material, and bring misery and death. If the I. W. W. can get other organizations to push this program, so much the better.

Boring From Within

How will the I. W. W. organize unemployed workers for production? By locating the empty jobs and then filling them, organizing to go back to work. Heretofore the efforts of the labor movement have been directed towards stopping industry. Thirty-thousand textile workers left the mills in Lawrence in

1912. Most of them are idle now. Organizing them to go back to work is the need now.

Dual unionism has been charged against the I. W. W. There are dual unions but there is no duality on the job. A union really built into the industry will have little conflict with another built in. The conflict comes between unions off the job fighting for membership. Boring-within the other union to disrupt it and boring-within the industry to co-ordinate it are two vastly different things.

Such is the I. W. W. as it is developing today. That part of its membership is not in thorough accord with this program goes without saying, but this is the dominant trend. This sheer industrialism is essentially an outgrowth of American development, though the influence of Europe has not been lacking. It cannot be said that the writings of the guild socialists have been read to any extent by the I. W. W. membership, or that they have been altogether accepted when read. The emphasis placed on industrial knowledge by Russian leaders since the revolution has, however, been eagerly noted by the I. W. W., though it is seen here that the science of industry serves equally in making the present struggles more efficient.

What Happened at Tours

Francis Treat

THE break at Tours was not to be avoided.

Ever since the February congress at Strassburg, the majority in the French Socialist Party has been steadily shifting to the left. This has been partly due to the intensive propaganda of the Committee of the Third International, partly due also to the efforts of Cachin and Frossard who, since their journey of investigation in Russia, have thrown all the weight of their personal influence on the side of the Moscow International.

The most important factor, however, is the present economic situation—in every respect lamentable. Prices remain high. Wages are being lowered everywhere. The spread of unemployment is tremendous. Heavy taxation, the offensive tactics of the bourgeoisie since the May strike (the formation of armed civic leagues, etc.), the costly military expeditions in Syria and Silisia, the constant menace of new wars; these are all responsible for the rapid development of the revolutionary spirit among the workers.

The increasing power of the C. S. R.

(Comité Syndicaliste Révolutionnaire) attests its presence in the syndicates. Its action in the Socialist Party is visible in the drift of the majority towards the revolutionary doctrines and tactics of the Third International. Both manifestations tend towards a break with the old leaders—with the conservatism of Jouhaux, Meerheim, and Dumoulin in the C. G. T. (Confédération Générale du Travail) and that of Blum, Renaudel, and Longuet in the Parti Socialiste Français.

The Three Resolutions

The congress called at Tours, December 25, 1920, to decide the question of the Third International, was confronted by three resolutions: that of the Right wing (resolution Blum) opposing the theses and conditions of Moscow; that of the Center (resolution Longuet-Paul Faure) requesting admission with a maximum of reserves; and that of the Left (Cachin-Frossard) favoring admission according to the conditions imposed by the committee of the Third International.*

From the first, there was no doubt as to which resolution would carry. The votes obtained at the local meetings of the different federations, meetings held during the month that preceded the congress of Tours, had already registered the fact that fully two-thirds of the party favored the motion submitted by the Left. All but three of the great cities of France, a long list of departments, the industrial centers (Seine, Seine et Oise, the North, the Pas de Calais, the basins of the Loire, the Saone, and the Rhone) had given strong majorities to the resolution Cachin-Frossard. Nearly all the delegates at Tours had received imperative mandates. The decision of the congress could be predicted with absolute certainty.

*The motion Cachin-Frossard contained certain minor reservations: no change in the name of the party; no exclusions; parallel, not subordinate action in the syndicates. These reservations had been conceded by the Executive committee of the Third International. There was in reality a fourth resolution—Leroy-Heine—which requested admittance to the T. I. according to the letter of the 21 conditions. This resolution obtained only 43 votes at the congress, votes which were later transferred to the resolution Cachin-Frossard.

And given the certainty of the vote, a split in the party was inevitable.

From the time when the 21 conditions of Moscow were first made public, the leaders of the Right wing had made no secret of their opposition to the doctrines and tactics of Moscow. Blum and Renaudel, together with the majority of the Socialist deputies, launched a series of attacks, oral and written, against the 21 conditions and the theses of the Third International. They stated openly that if the congress should vote to adhere to the International of Moscow they and their following would straightway abandon the party. Their position found frank and loyal expression in the resolution submitted by Leon Blum—a concise and definite statement of their belief in (a) the value of parliamentary action, government collaboration, and reformism; (b) the necessity of maintaining the principle of national defense; and (c) the error of centralizing party authority, of suppressing proportional representation, of forming clandestine organizations, of introducing politics into the syndicates, of excluding certain party leaders, etc., etc. This document, together with the statements made by the Right wing of the party, made it perfectly clear that this group would secede after the vote of the congress.

Center vs. Left

It was much less easy to anticipate the action of the Center. Their position was on the whole difficult of analysis. The resolution Longuet-Paul Faure, although it condemned ministerialism and discreetly avoided the question, always delicate, of national defense, appeared on the whole to be a re-statement, less open and direct perhaps, of the resolution Blum. The only radical difference between the two lay in the conclusion. The leaders of the Right stated that, given their interpretation of the principles and tactics of Moscow, it would be "an action unworthy of the party and of the Third International itself to request admittance to the latter." The Center, on the other hand, after having repudiated the principal theses

of Moscow and all but three of the 21 conditions, still felt justified in requesting to be admitted to membership in the Third International, on the basis of the resolution Longuet-Paul Faure. To the Left Wing of the party, the position of the Center seemed particularly illogical. "The Center wants to go to Moscow and refuses all the means of getting there," was the characteristic comment of one of the leaders of the Left.

From the opening of the congress, the attitude of the Left with respect to the Center rendered the position of the latter extremely difficult. This attitude was two-fold and included: a disdain for a policy deemed wavering and ill-defined and at the same time a real hesitancy and a sincere unwillingness to break with men who, like Paul Faure, Longuet and others, had proved their worth during the difficult days of the war. While the debates between Left and Right took place in comparative calm and were characterized on the whole by a degree of courtesy and mutual respect, those between Left and Center were always heated, bristled with personalities, and alternated recriminations, warnings, and appeals. . . . The fragments that follow are typical:

Center: "Your troops are composed of sentimentalists. They voted to join forces with the Third International in utter ignorance of what such action implies. Your leaders are fanatics. They will lead the party, the whole proletarian class, to destruction. Whereas in England. . . ."

Left: "Your point of view doesn't exist. Your resolution is nil. You can't continue to straddle. You are with us or you are against us—Right, or Left. Don't let a question of petty pride . . ." etc., etc.

Throughout the congress, the Right remained more or less aloof. Having presented its point of view in two dignified addresses by Leon Blum and Marcel Sembat, its members took little part in the debate and left the rigors of the discussion to the Left and Center.

As the congress progressed, it became evident that the Center was concentrating its

opposition on two points: the question of exclusions and that of minority rights. In reply the Left promised that minorities should be represented everywhere except on the central executive body (*Comité Directeur*) and the administrative board of *l'Humanité*. Positively no exclusions. All party members who accept the decisions of the majority and are willing to be governed by party discipline, remain in the party, whatever may have been their past action or their present opinions. At this point in the discussion, the Center revealed its lack of unity. Certain of its members appeared satisfied with the propositions of the Left; certain others remained intransigent and uncompromising. Questions, reiterations, hesitations. The speakers began to mark time. It seemed that in case the Center did not split, the debate would be prolonged indefinitely.

The Zinoviev Telegram

The telegram of Zinoviev, brutal and direct, dropped like a bolt into the chaos of the discussion.

"The resolution Longuet-Paul Faure is conceived in so narrow and petty a spirit of reformism that we cannot think of approving it. Longuet and his friends have been and remain the specific agents of bourgeois influence on the proletariat. . . . The Communist International can have nothing in common with the authors of such a motion. . . . The worst service that could be rendered the French proletariat would be to fetter it with some such vague compromise. . . ."

One can state with perfect veracity that the Center seceded on the basis of the telegram of Zinoviev. It was the point towards which all further discussion converged. All the efforts of the Left were powerless to calm the ire of the Centrists. "We have no faith in your promises. You are mere tools in the hand of Zinoviev. Even here at Tours you are subject to the authority of an occult representative of Moscow!" When the tempest of accusations and denials had somewhat subsided, Mistral, of the Center, presented a second resolution. The party should register its disapproval of the telegram of Zinoviev and should declare its firm intention of preserving the "present unity of the party."

Otherwise the Center would secede. The motion was lost; the Left maintained that there was no "present unity" in the party and that in view of the attitude of the Right on the question of the Third International there could be none in the future.

The Center Secedes

It has been alleged with some appearance of plausibility that the Center was not displeased at the turn of events, and that the Centrists seized the pretext of the Zinoviev telegram in order to avoid the appearance of responsibility in the party split. "If there had been no telegram," stated one of their members,* "we would have seceded on the question of minority rights. Had our demands been granted, we would have seceded on the question of the congress at Vienna." However that may be, the fact remains that in leaving the party the majority of the Centrists based their action on the statements contained in the Zinoviev telegram. It may be mentioned incidentally that the vote on the question of the Third International was distributed as follows:

Resolution Cachin-Frossard....	3,248	votes
" Longuet-Paul Faure	1,022	"
" Blum	397	"

After the vote was announced the Right, as had been anticipated, withdrew from the congress.

The former Center has now joined forces with the Right to form the Socialist Party, S. F. I. O. (Section Française de l'Internationale Ouvrière). The Secretary of the new party is Paul Faure, leader of the Centrists (for Paul Faure is the real leader of the Centrists, not Longuet, whose importance has been greatly exaggerated). In spite of the presence in the new party of many of the old party leaders, there is every prospect that the S. F. I. O. will be dominated by the policy of the Centrists, and that the former chiefs who like Renaudel were bitterly combatted by Faure and Longuet during the war, will be gradually eclipsed. There has been some attempt, as yet unsuccessful, to gain

control of the organ of the old party, *l'Humanité*. For the time being the official organ of the S. F. I. O. is the evening paper, *le Populaire*, of which Longuet and Paul Faure are editors.

The Communists

Abandoned by the dissidents, the original party now contains from 60 to 70 per cent of the former party-members. In reality not all the Center has seceded. Certain Centrists have decided to remain in the party as a matter of discipline; others, because of their dislike of uniting with the Right; others—and these are the least desirable—because the voters of their district have remained in the party. Of the deputies only fifteen are Left; the forty others who were members of the Right seceded with their group. The leaders of the party S. F. I. C. (Section Française de l'Internationale Communiste) are Frossard, who has been re-elected Secretary, and the deputies Marcel Cachin and Paul Vaillant-Couturier. *L'Humanité*, the paper founded by Jaurès, remains the organ of the party.

Two Unified Groups

By the action of the Congress of Tours, the pact of unity of 1905 is now dissolved. It must be remembered, however, that the unity of the former French Socialist Party was in fact merely nominal, that it was a mere unity of façade which, as Clara Zetkin said during her dramatic visit at Tours, covered a series of tendencies which might be said to extend all the way from Scheidemann and Noske to Liebknecht. It is true that the Parti Socialiste Unifié has ceased to exist, but in its place are two groups, vigorous and energetic, each of which is now preparing a serious campaign of socialist propaganda. Independent of the question of tendencies in case neither group devotes the major part of its energy to combating the other, the break occasioned at Tours may not be lacking in happy results for the cause of socialism at large. For as each of the parties stated the day following the congress: "The party is divided but—*le socialisme continue!*"

*Maurin

The Socialist Vote at the Last Election

Isaac A. Hourwich

THE total vote of Eugene V. Debs last November fell far short of the general expectations which were shared by friend and foe alike. The aggregate vote was only 15,000 in excess of the total number polled by him in 1912, the increase being short of 2 per cent., whereas the total number of voters of all the parties was 77 per cent. in excess of the aggregate Presidential vote of 1912.

It has been sought to account for this failure by the schism within the ranks of the Socialist Party organization. On closer examination of the figures, however, it appears that this explanation does not account for the slump in the socialist vote. Comparison of the votes polled by Debs last November with the Benson vote in 1916 shows an increase of 56 per cent., whereas the aggregate vote of all the parties increased only 44 per cent., which shows that some of the socialist voters who supported Wilson in 1916, returned to the socialist fold in 1920. The others, the greater part, were lost as far back as 1916, long before the party convention in 1919, which was the beginning of the split within the party ranks. The increase and decrease of the socialist vote seems to be a result of the general political sentiment of the country, rather than of internal party politics. This conclusion is confirmed by the comparison of the socialist votes cast in the presidential elections of 1912, 1916 and 1920 in the several states.

From 1912 to 1920

The vote for the head of the ticket in 1916, compared with that for 1912, showed a loss in every state except Florida and North Carolina, where the increase was 1,420 votes, whereas the aggregate loss in all other states exceeded 300,000. At the last election, on the contrary, the presidential vote in a few states showed a greater proportional increase

than the total number of votes cast, which indicates that the gain was not due solely to the addition of new voters, but that at the last election Debs received the votes of many persons who had in 1912 voted for Roosevelt or Wilson. These states with the number of votes cast for the socialist candidate for president are shown in the table next following:

States	Socialist Vote		
	1912	1916	1920
New York	63,381	45,190	203,400
Wisconsin	33,481	27,849	80,631
Massachusetts	12,616	11,058	32,265
Maryland	3,996	2,674	8,876

It appears from the preceding table that the greatest increase of the socialist vote was recorded in the state of New York, which was the center of hostilities within the party. The second place is held by Wisconsin, where the party is outspokenly reformistic. In Massachusetts, where the Left Wing was very strong, Debs polled nearly three times as many votes as Benson, whereas the aggregate presidential vote in that state increased within the four years only 86 per cent.

If the comparison is confined to the last two presidential elections a few more states come in where the socialist gain was relatively greater than the increase of the aggregate vote for all parties, although the Socialist Party has not fully recovered from its loss in the second Wilson campaign. In other words, this apparent increase does not represent new socialist votes, but rather the prodigal sons that found their way back into their old home. These states are shown in the following table:

States	Socialist Vote	
	1916	1920
Pennsylvania	42,367	70,021
Minnesota	20,117	56,106
Michigan	16,120	28,947
New Jersey	10,462	27,217
Connecticut	5,179	10,335
Delaware	480	1,002

The increase of the socialist vote in these states may be accounted for by the personality of Eugene V. Debs. We shall, therefore, compare the gubernatorial votes for 1918 and 1920 in Michigan and Connecticut and the votes for United States Senator in Pennsylvania for the same years.* The results of this comparison are shown in the following table:

States	Socialist Vote			
	For Governor		For President	
	1918	1920	1916	1920
Pennsylvania...	18,706	67,316	42,637	70,201
Michigan.....	7,068	23,542	16,120	28,947
Connecticut.....	4,001	10,154	5,179	10,335

It can be seen from the preceding table that, although a part of the Debs vote was a personal one, the straight party vote increased in those states from 1918 to 1920 at a higher rate than the vote for the Presidential candidate. In Pennsylvania and Michigan the war sentiment apparently cut the socialist vote between 1916 and 1918 by more than half. On the contrary, since 1918 the socialist vote more than trebled. This occurred precisely after the split in the Party.

Gain in Industrial Centers

These figures show that the Socialist Party gained votes in the great industrial states of the Atlantic seacoast from Massachusetts to Maryland, and in the middle West in the states of Michigan, Wisconsin and Minnesota, with such industrial centers as Detroit, Milwaukee, Minneapolis and St. Paul. On the other hand, the loss of the socialist vote in Illinois, as compared with 1912, seems to be the result of the organization of the Farmer-Labor Party rather than of the defection of the Left Wing. In 1912 Debs polled in Illinois 81,278 votes, in 1916 Benson polled 61,394 votes. The real loss was much greater because in Illinois women voted in 1916. Since that time the socialist vote in Illinois reached the figure 74,747, whereas the aggregate vote cast for all the parties in that state was 4 per cent. below that cast in

1916. The Socialist Party accordingly gained 21 per cent. in comparison with 1916. In addition to this, however, the Farmer-Labor Party polled 49,630 votes, and the aggregate vote for both parties amounted to 124,377, which was more than twice the Benson vote of 1916.

Effect of Farmer-Labor Vote

The effect of the organization of the Farmer-Labor Party is still more striking in the State of Washington. There Debs polled 40,134 votes in 1912, Benson in 1916 polled only one-half of that number—22,800. In 1920 Debs' vote was 8,913 which was less than he had polled in 1904, but the Farmer-Labor Party polled 77,246 votes. The aggregate vote for both Labor candidates was more than twice as high as Debs' vote in 1912, whereas the aggregate vote cast for all parties increased only 22 per cent. If the comparison is confined to the last two elections the result is still more striking: The number of labor votes in 1920 was nearly four times as large as in 1916, whereas the aggregate vote cast for all parties increased only 3 per cent.

New Values

The preceding examination thus shows that the comparative failure of the Socialist Party at the last election was not due to party schism or defections to the Communists. The leading question still remains: Why is it that whereas in Europe the socialist parties have won a leading position in public affairs, the Socialist Party of the United States has, on the whole, lost much of the small vote which it had gathered after so many years of agitation? In Finland the Social Democratic Party was organized only one year before our Socialist Party, yet in 1916 it polled a majority of all the votes cast for the diet. Surely no one will maintain that Finland is more highly developed industrially than the United States.

A transvaluation of all values is now going on in the socialist parties of all other countries. A similar revision is urgent in the United States as well.

* In the other three states of the preceding table there were no elections for state officers.

War and Peace

Nationalism. By G. P. Gooch. Pp. 127. N. Y.: Harcourt, Brace and Howe. 1920.

Patriotism and the Superstate. By J. L. Stocks. Pp. 105. N. Y.: Harcourt, Brace and Howe. 1920.

Causes of International War. By G. Lowes Dickinson. Pp. 108. N. Y.: Harcourt, Brace and Howe. 1920.

These three small octavo volumes of about a hundred pages each are the first instalment of a series of popular handbooks on International Relations, edited by G. Lowes Dickinson. The object of the series is "to develop what H. G. Wells has called the 'International mind.'" "For the world," as the editor says, "can be saved only by the creation, among the peoples of the world, of such public opinion as cannot be duped by misrepresentation or misled by passion."

The idea is excellent, and, of course, the first condition of its realization is the production of handbooks that are truly popular, that is, sufficiently simple to be understood by the people and sufficiently interesting to be read by the people. Mr. Gooch's book is neither of these things. It is an accurate, crowded, prosaic abstract of nationalistic aspirations in every part of Europe (and in some parts of Asia and Africa) from the outbreak of the French Revolution to the close of the World War. For an expert in the history of the 19th century it would serve as a clever, rapid outline; for the ordinary business or professional man it can be only a bewildering succession of names and dates. Only once (pp. 47-49) does Mr. Gooch pause to discuss, in connection with Mazzini and Young Italy, the meaning or nature of nationality.

Mr. Stock's book is more appealing. It is devoted to the thesis that patriotism, being a compound of love of country and willingness to serve one's country, is a voluntary, vital and hence critical disposition of mind to the citizen, which is not to be confused with the mere "acquiescence, mis-called patriotism by politicians when it seems to them to be useful." Patriotism can live only in the atmosphere of freedom, and "there is no guarantee," says Mr. Stocks, "that actions of purest patriotism will not appear unpatriotic to most or many." (p. 44). But at the same time, patriotism without nationalism is a soul without a body. The proposal, therefore, to do away with nationalism in order to bring about a society of nations, Mr. Stocks regards as folly. It would sacrifice all that a society of nations would be formed to safeguard. Only a super state, a government whose control should be sufficiently strong to allow the rivalries of nations full play

under it within the realm of law, can preserve the two equally precious concepts of patriotism and nationalism. "Under government," the author concludes (p. 105), "the rivalry of England, France, and Germany might be as profitable to the world as the rivalry of Yorkshire and Lancaster now is to England." It is interesting to note that H. G. Wells, in his "*Outlines of History*," places the same confidence in the salvation of our distressed world through *political* healing.

Mr. Dickinson's little treatise on "Causes of International War" goes back to prehistoric man to show that war is a comparatively recent activity of the human race. Fights there undoubtedly were from the first, when two men or two tribes desired the same woman, or the same pastures; but the development of a special fighting class, the "institutionalizing of war," was the sinister thing that started us on the way to our present state of "armed patriotism" and "armed egotism." Mr. Dickinson attacks with a keen pen the equivocations of patriotism—the age-long falsehood that preparation for war is the best way to preserve peace, the fiction that men in war are sacrificing their selfish desires to the state, whereas in reality they are only indulging them through the state, the almost universal readiness of a state just freed from coercion to coerce others. "There is hardly one of the new states called into life by the victory of the Allies," he truly says, "that is not coercing under its rule large alien populations and openly aspiring to a career of power" (p. 39.)

Mr. Dickinson sees in governments, foreign offices, diplomats, and officers, no hope for the abolition of war. As to diplomats, "war, sooner or later, is the presupposition of their whole activity" (p. 65), and, as to officers, they could not work against war (in spite of the "crocodile tears" of army and navy men over the horrors of war) unless they should "undergo a conversion that would shatter their whole life." (p. 74).

What is the remedy, then, for international war? Mr. Dickinson answers, "Intellect prompted by humanity." In school, press, platform, pulpit, "Internationalists must contend with imperialists for the mind and soul of the peoples." "They must destroy romantic illusions, and insist upon the hard plain facts. They must return again and again, from every angle of approach, to the fundamental problem of war and peace. They must treat war as a problem, not an axiom, a catastrophe not a glory, a disease to diagnose not an achievement to realize. . . . The way is laborious and difficult. But there is no other" (p. 108).

Well may Mr. Dickinson say that the way is hard—and lonesome are the handful who travel it!

D. S. MUZZEY.

Book Notes

Workers' Education. A pamphlet. By Arthur Gleason. N. Y.: Bureau of Industrial Research. 1920.

A masterly survey of the field of workers' education here and abroad and an analysis of some of the important problems in this field.

My Years of Exile. By Eduard Bernstein. Translated by Bernard Miall. N. Y.: Harcourt, Brace and Co. 1921. 286 pp.

A spirited account of the travels and years of exile of the German Revisionist socialist in Italy, Switzerland, Denmark, and England. The book gives intimate glimpses of William Morris, Bernard Shaw, the Webbs, Ramsay MacDonald, Karl Marx, Engels and others.

The Marriage Laws of Soviet Russia. N. Y.: Russian Soviet Government Bureau. 1921. 85 pp.

A complete text of the first code of laws of the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic dealing with domestic relations. "The code is a superb rebuke to those psychopathically afflicted persons who spread the sickly tattle about 'nationalization of women.'"

The Sword and the Cross. By Kirby Page. Chicago: The Christian Century Press. 1921. 107 pp.

A challenge to youth to follow uncompromisingly the pacifist teachings of Jesus.

A Religion for the New Day. By Charles F. Dole. N. Y.: B. W. Huebsch. 1920. 295 pp.

An attempt to set forth a mode of religion which will serve as a spiritual gospel and working force for a humane and democratic world. The author feels that the application of religion to life would lead to some form of industrial democracy.

The Ways of the Gods. By Algernon Sidney Crapsey. N. Y.: The International Press, 150 Lafayette St. 1921. 406 pp.

A story of the lives of the various gods that have been worshipped in the Western world from the days of the household gods to the present time. The author sets forth the way in which economic and political conditions determine the kind of deity worshipped in particular epochs. Dr. Crapsey contends that the new religion, the religion of humanity, teaches that "the service of man is the service of God."

Debs and the Poets. Edited by Ruth Le Prade. With an Introduction by Upton Sinclair. Pasadena, Cal.: Upton Sinclair, 1920.

Poems and letters from a score of well known poets and writers concerning the great socialist leader.

The Slaughter of the Jews in the Ukraine in 1919. By Elias Heifetz. J. U. D.: N. Y.: Thomas Seltzer. 1921. 408 pp.

An authentic account of the Jewish tragedy in the Ukraine in 1919. Incidentally Dr. Heifetz gives an illuminating insight into revolutionary Russia.

The Jungle. By Upton Sinclair. Pasadena, Cal.: Published by the Author. 1920. 413 pp.

A paper bound edition of Sinclair's famous novel first published in 1906. "A book that does for modern industrial slavery," according to Arthur Brisbane, "what 'Uncle Tom's Cabin' did for black slavery."

Unifying the World. By G. N. Clark. N. Y.: Harcourt, Brace & Co. 1920. 116 pp.

An attempt to show the interrelationships between world peace and the methods of communications among nations.

The United States of America ex. rel. Milwaukee Social Democratic Publishing Company vs. Albert S. Burleson, Postmaster General of the United States. Motion for leave to file brief of the Workingmen's Cooperative Publishing Association. S. John Block, Counsel.

American Minimum Wage Laws at Work. By Dorothy W. Douglas. N. Y.: National Consumers' League. 1920. 41 pp.

Taft Papers on the League of Nations. Speeches and Letters of Ex-President William Howard Taft. Edited by Theodore Marburg and Horace E. Flack. N. Y.: Macmillan Co. 1920. 340 pp.

Fire. By Charles W. Garrett. Puyallup, Washington: The Author. 1918. 142 pp.

A "scenario" depicting a few of the important events in the story of man, beginning in the epoch preceding his use of fire.

Side Issues. By Jeffrey E. Jeffrey. N. Y.: Thomas Seltzer. 1920. 256 pp.

A book of short stories of the war written from a distinctly unconventional standpoint. Contains an appeal to the youth to vindicate his rights in the new era.

Broken Shackles. By John Gordon. Philadelphia, Pa.: Dorrance and Co. 1920. 270 pp. A novel of work and of the wages of work.

The Pertinent Wagnerite. By B. M. Steigman. N. Y.: Thomas Seltzer. 1921. 127 pp.

An appeal for the complete restoration of Wagner, with an analysis of Wagnerian music drama.

H. W. L.

College Notes

During the year Harry W. Laidler, the Secretary of the Society, took three short trips in the interest of the Society, two to the New England states, and one to the South.

The Fall trip to Massachusetts has already been mentioned in these columns. In January, Secretary Laidler went to Baltimore, and on January 24th, addressed about 125 members and friends of the Social Science Club of Johns Hopkins University on "Guild Socialism" in the Auditorium of the Civil Engineer's Building. B. B. Bramble is the moving spirit of the club among the undergraduates and Broadus Mitchell among the instructors.

While in Baltimore, Dr. Laidler also addressed a group at the home of Elizabeth Gilman on "The World Wide Cooperative Movement." Agnes Armington Laidler sang.

On his return trip the Secretary spoke at the morning "collection" at Swarthmore College before the entire student body, and later before several combined economic classes.

On February 23, Dr. Laidler debated on Socialism with Professor James M. Carroll, head of the Department of Economics, Bates College, Lewiston, Maine. The college hall was crowded to capacity with some four or five hundred college men and women and townspeople. President Gray, of Bates presided, and the addresses of both speakers were received with enthusiasm. The event was described as the Politics Club's "greatest achievement."

The following day the Secretary spoke before the Economics Club of the University of Maine, of which Fred Jordan is president. On the morning of the 24th he addressed several combined classes in economics on "The City of the Future," followed by a short talk in Chapel on "The New World in the Making."

On Sunday, March 6th, Dr. Laidler debated Mr. Frank Hackett, a representative of the National Security League, in the People's Forum of Orange on the "Pros and Cons of Socialism."

The HARVARD Liberal Club is making ambitious plans for the reception of an organizing convention to be held at Harvard April 2nd and 3rd for the purpose of forming an intercollegiate liberal league,—a central student association to promote among undergraduates a wider interest in the problems of national and world citizenship." The aims and policies of the new organization are to be formulated at the convention. In the meantime, the organizing committee announces two majority opinions concerning the nature of the proposed organization, viz:

(Continued on back of cover.)

THE American Empire

a stirring new book on the United States and its relation to world affairs

By

SCOTT NEARING

Packed with information; priced so that you can afford it.

272 pages postpaid; paper, 50 cents; cloth, \$1.

RAND BOOK STORE
7 East 15th Street, New York

Communism and Christianity :

Analyzed and Contrasted from the Viewpoint of Darwinism, by Bishop William Montgomery Brown, D.D. Paper, pages 184, artistic cover, price 25 cents. Six copies mailed for \$1.00.

Comments by eleven persons : ¶One of the most startling and revolutionary books ever issued. ¶It comes like a meteor across a dark sky. ¶Send twelve copies. It is the best book I ever read to open the eyes and set the brain working. ¶It held me tight. I call it a sermon. The text is astounding: Banish gods from skies and capitalists from earth. ¶Bishop Brown is the reincarnation of Thomas Paine and his book is the modern Age of Reason. ¶Every comrade buys one and comes back for more. ¶It will do a wonderful work in this the greatest crisis in all history. ¶I think it is one of the most important books of a Socialist nature issued in a number of years. It is full of marvelously good material and will open many eyes. ¶Sold twenty-five in a jiffy; send three hundred for next meeting. ¶The author, an Episcopalian ecclesiastic, has squarely renounced all theology and unreservedly accepted the Marxian philosophy of economic determinism. In this book he approaches the subject of Socialism from a new angle and has produced a propaganda work that will be of intense interest to all. ¶I can sell three thousand within sixty days. Write for terms to book sellers and to propagandists. Twentieth thousand now in press.

THE BRADFORD-BROWN EDUCATIONAL CO., Inc.
GALION, OHIO

Special Offer—

"Socialism in Thought and Action." 546 pp.

"Study Courses in Socialism." 16 pp.

"Public Ownership Throughout the World." 48 pp.

By Harry W. Laidler

Price for three, \$2.75

I. S. S., 70 Fifth Ave., N. Y. City.

Preliminary Announcement

THE SUMMER CONFERENCE OF THE INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY WILL BE HELD JUNE 23-27, 1921

SUBJECT:

"New Tendencies in Labor and Radical Movements"

It is proposed to open the conference with a general survey of the labor and socialist movements here and abroad. The succeeding sessions will be devoted to the latest developments in the coöperative movement, the labor movement, the socialist, communist, and other radical political movements, winding up with "The Future of Radicalism in America."

(Details of the program subject to revision.)

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION WRITE THE
I. S. S., 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City